LIBRARY OF PRINCETON
JAN 7 1959
THEOLOGICAL SEMINARY
SCC
2260
V. 4

Theological Seminary
Presented by
Hon Brockholst Livingston
N. Y.

THE

WORKS

OF THE

REV. JOHN WITHERSPOON, D. D. L. L. D.

LATE PRESIDENT OF THE COLLEGE AT PRINCETON,

NEW-JERSEY.

TO WHICH IS PREFIXED

An Account of the Author's Life, in a Sermon occasioned by his Death,

BY THE REV. DR. JOHN RODGERS,

OF NEW-YORK.

IN FOUR VOLUMES.——VOL. IV.

SECOND EDITION, REVISED AND CORRECTED.

PHILADELPHIA:

Printed and Published by WILLIAM W. WOODWARD,

N°. 52, South Second Street.

1802.

[Copy Right Secured.]

WILLIAM W. WOODWARD,

52, *South-Second, corner of Chesnut-Street,*

HAS AN EXTENSIVE ASSORTMENT OF VALUABLE

BOOKS,

AMONG WHICH ARE,

	Dolls.	*Cts.*
WITSIUS' Economy of the Covenant —3 vols.	5	25
Horæ Solitaræ—2 vols.	3	25
Brown's Dictionary of the Bible—2 vols.	5	
Mosheim's Ecclesiastical History—6 vols.	12	
Edwards on Redemption	2	
Do. on Affections	1	
Morse's Gazetteer—small	1	25
Life of Christ, small folio	5	25
Do. do. Octavo—2 vols.	3	25
Death of Christ		87½
Burkitt's Commentary on the New Testament, folio	8	25
Do. do. do. Quarto	7	
Cook's Voyage—4 vols. with plates	8	
Do. do. 2 vols. do.	2	50
Whitefield's Life and Sermons	1	
Milot's Ancient History—5vols.	9	
Life of Watts and Doddridge	1	25
Discourses on the love of God and its influences on the Passions, by I. Watts		75
Watt's Logic	1	
Do. on the Mind	1	
Boston's Fourfold State	1	
Booth's Reign of Grace		87
Rise and Progress of Religion		75
Davis's Sermons—2 vols.	4	
Dickinson on Five Points		62½
Zimmerman on Solitude	1	
Death of Abel and Cain		62½
Hervey's Meditations	1	

Newton's Works—9 vols.	7	50
Revival of Religion—bound		87½
Do. do. small pamphlet		25
Village Dialogues, by the celebrated Roland Hill		25
Gospel its on Witness	1	25
Gospel Acceptation		75
Religious Repository—2 vols.	1	25
New Pilgrim		62½
Spalding's Lectures on the Millenium		80
Beauties of the Spectator	2	25
Addisonian Miscellany	1	
Luther on the Gallatians	2	
Blair's Sermons—2 vols.	3	
Walker's do.—2 vols.	3	
Do. do.	6	
Life of Fletcher		75
Hawies' Commentary on the Bible, 2 vols. fol.	28	
Book of Martyrs—2 vols. plates	12	
Do. do.—1 do.	6	
Adams' Astronomy	3	50
Ferguson's Astronomy	3	50
Buffon's Natural History, abridged—2 vols.	7	
Art of Singing, by A. Law, half bound	1	75
Do. do. do. full do.	2	

With a very extensive and valuable assortment of Books and Stationary.—Catalogues to be had gratis.

In the press and will soon be published, "*The Beauties of the Evangelical Magazine.*"—To subscribers 4 dollars, in two volumes, to be paid on delivery of the first volume. To non-subscribers the price will be raised.

CONTENTS.

	PAGE
INTRODUCTORY Lecture on Divinity,	9
Letters on Education,	125
Letters on Marriage,	161
Address to the inhabitants of Jamaica, and other West-India Islands, in behalf of the College of New-Jersey,	185
An Essay on Money, as a medium of commerce; with remarks on the advantages and disadvantages of paper admitted into general circulation,	203
Speech in the Synod of Glasgow, when I was accused of being the author of the Ecclesiastical Characteristics,	245
An Humble Supplication to such of the Nobility and Gentry of Scotland as are Elders of the Church, and members of the General Assembly,	267

Speech in the General Assembly, on the Transportation of Dr. C———, - 273

Letter sent to Scotland for the Scots Magazine, - - - - - 281

Ignorance of the British with respect to America, - - - - - 289

Reflections on the present State of Public Affairs, and on the Duty and Interest of America in this important crisis, - 293

Thoughts on American Liberty, - 297

On the Controversy about Independence, 301

On conducting the American Controversy, 305

Aristides, - - - 309

Part of a Speech in Congress, on the Conference proposed by Lord Howe, - 317

Speech in Congress, on the Convention with General Burgoyne, - - - 325

Speech in Congress, on a motion for paying the Interest of Loan-Office Certificates, 333

Part of a Speech in Congress, on the Finances, 339

Part of a Speech in Congress, upon the Confederation, - - - 347

Speech in Congress, on the appointment of Plenipotentiaries, - - - 353

On the proposed Market in General Washington's Camp, - - 359

Address to General Washington, - 363

Memorial and Manifesto of the United States of North-America, - - - 365

On the Contest between Great-Britain and America, - - - 375

On the Affairs of the United States, 379

Observations on the Improvement of America, - - - 385

Supplication of J. R * * * * * * * *, 387

Recantation of Benjamin Towne, - 397

A Description of the State of New-Jersey, 403

A few Reflections on the Federal City, 413

On the Georgia Constitution, - 421

The Druid, originally published in numbers periodically, - - - 425

e.

INTRODUCTORY LECTURE

ON

DIVINITY.

IT is a very agreeable thing to see a number of young persons determined to apply themselves to the study of divinity. We must charitably hope that they are actuated by the noblest principles; that they are resolved to devote their life and talents to the service of Christ in the gospel. He is a good master; his service is liberty. They have not any flattering prospect of an illustrious or opulent state; but they may have in that office, the greatest inward consolation, and very commonly more serenity and peace, and as much of the real and desirable enjoyment of this life, as any class of men whatever.

It is altogether agreeable to the design of this institution, to have young men of piety and ability fitted for the public services of the churches. This was the very point in view with the worthy founders of this seminary, some of whom are yet alive; and as there was never, perhaps, any seminary, the support of which was more the effect of faith and dependance upon God, so it is to be hoped that he will honour many of the youth brought up in it, with employment in his vineyard and success in his service.

If I may be allowed to say any thing personal, I incline to add, that it is peculiarly agreeable to me. Nothing would give me a higher pleasure, than being instrumental in furnishing the minds and improving the talents of those who may hereafter be the ministers of the everlasting gospel. The hope of it is, indeed, the chief comfort in my present station. Notwithstanding the many encouraging circumstances that have happened since my arrival here, and the evident smiles of Providence upon the college, yet I confess I have often regretted the want of a pastoral charge. After having been for twenty three years constantly employed in preaching the gospel to a numerous, obedient, and affectionate people, to be employed in a way of life so considerably different, must have created some uneasiness. Just figure to yourselves, one that had been so long accustomed to preach to a crouded audience of from twelve to fifteen hundred souls every day, and all subject to my private oversight and discipline; now to have such a thin and negligent assembly, and mostly composed of those who think themselves under no obligation to attend, but when they please. In such a situation the sphere of usefulness seems to be greatly narrowed; but if I am made instrumental in sending out faithful labourers into the harvest, it will be an ample recompence; for as one of great zeal and discernment expressed himself to me in Britain: "You will be greatly mortified to see the difference between a small country society in America, and a large city congregation in Scotland; but if you be instrumental in sending out ministers of the New Testament, it will be a still more important station, for every gownsman is a legion."

In this preliminary discourse, what I chiefly mean is to repeat, and endeavour to bring you to enter into, the great and leading view which you ought to have in your studies, and which I desire to have still before my eyes in teaching. This may be expressed in one sentence—to unite together piety and literature—to shew their relation to, and their influence one upon another—and to guard against any thing that may tend to separate them, and set them in opposition one to another. This is of more con-

ſequence, and indeed, of more difficulty, than perhaps you will, as yet, be able to apprehend;—experience however, has taught me to view it in a moſt important light. Some perſons truly, and perhaps eminently pious, from an inward conviction that religion is better than all the learning in the world; and perhaps obſerving that ill-principled perſons, the more learning they have are the more dangerous to the truth; have come to deſpiſe learning itſelf, as if the natural talent was to blame for the moral depravity. Of thoſe who profeſs religion, ſome alſo, from a forward zeal, are impatient to begin the miniſtry before they are fitted for the charge: ſuch perſons are often quite inſenſible to the hurt they do to the intereſt of religion, and how much they injure the truths of God, by their manner of handling them. On the other hand, there are ſome, who promiſed very well in early life, but applying with vigor and ſucceſs to their ſtudies, became too much enamoured with human wiſdom, and thought themſelves ſuch great ſcholars that they were too proud to be Chriſtians. Intellectual pride is perhaps as dangerous a diſtemper as any we are liable to. I have often thought that great natural abilities, and great acquired knowledge, operate as a temptation, in a way ſimilar to great wealth or external property—they are apt to intoxicate the mind—to produce ſelf ſufficiency and contempt of others, and to take away from that humility which is the greateſt beauty, or if the expreſſion be proper, the real glory of a Chriſtian. I would therefore begin, by earneſtly beſeeching you to keep clear views of the importance both of piety and literature, and never ſuffer them to be divided. Piety, without literature, is but little profitable; and learning, without piety, is pernicious to others, and ruinous to the poſſeſſor. Religion is the grand concern to us all, as we are men;—whatever be our calling and profeſſion, the ſalvation of our ſouls is the one thing needful. It is however, further and eſſentially neceſſary for a miniſter. I do not mean that it is neceſſary to the being of a miniſter in the viſible church, or to the efficacy of the ordinances of the goſpel to thoſe who receive them. This is, properly ſpeaking, a popiſh tenet, againſt which there is a queſtion in

the ſhorter catechiſm expreſsly levelled. " How do the ſacraments become effectual to ſalvation? The ſacraments (and it muſt be equally true of every other ordinance) become effectual to ſalvation, &c." Some weak enthuſiaſts have gone into this miſtake, and have ſaid it is as impoſſible for an unconverted miniſter to convert a ſoul, as for a dead man to beget a living child. A ſimilitude is no argument at all, properly ſpeaking, but only an illuſtration, if the thing itſelf be juſt. In this caſe it is wholly miſapplied, for it is neither the converted nor the unconverted miniſter that converts the ſoul, but the power of omnipotent grace, by any means that the God of grace ſees proper to employ. But on the other hand, this takes nothing away from the neceſſity of religion in a miniſter, when properly underſtood. It is certainly neceſſary, in the moſt abſolute ſenſe, to the faithful diſcharge of a miniſter's truſt; and for the ſame reaſon, it is of the greateſt importance to his ſucceſs. True religion ſeems to give a man that knowledge which is proper for a miniſter to direct and turn into its proper channel, the knowledge he may otherwiſe acquire. It ſeems neceſſary to make a miniſter active and diligent, upright and impartial, happy and ſucceſsful.

On this ſubject, I muſt give you the following particular advices:

I. Do not content yourſelves barely with ſound principles, much leſs turn religion into controverſy, but ſeek for inward vital comfort, to know in whom you have believed, and endeavour after the greateſt ſtrictneſs and tenderneſs of practice. When I deſire you to look for inward vital comfort, I do not mean that you ſhould wholly ſuſpend your preparations for the miniſtry, or immediately lay aſide thoughts of it, becauſe you have not all that clearneſs and ſatisfaction concerning your own ſtate, that you ſhould both deſire and endeavour to attain. There is hardly any principle ſo good, or any ſo clear, but it is within the reach of temptations, and capable of being perverted. Some being deeply convinced that it is a dreadful thing to preach an unknown Saviour, and not ſeeing reaſon to be wholly ſatisfied with themſelves, have been thrown into doubts and embarraſſed with ſcruples, and have given up

wholly that ſacred office, to which they ſeemed both inclined, and called; this ſeems to be taking a very unhappy, and a very blameable courſe. If ſuch fears had excited them to give all diligence to make their calling and election ſure, they would have been properly improved. But laying aſide the thoughts of the miniſtry only on this account, ſeems to carry in it a ſuppoſition, that they either do not intend, or do not hope, ever to be better. It is certainly to the public a much greater calamity, that there ſhould be a bad miniſter, than a bad man of ſome other profeſſion, but to the perſon himſelf, if he die in an unrenewed ſtate, it will bring but little comfort. I would have you upon this ſubject to obſerve, that real Chriſtians have very different degrees of comfort, and that if we examine the ſacred oracles with care and accuracy, we ſhall find that what is termed aſſurance, is juſt the grace of hope in lively exerciſe. It is called the aſſurance of hope, Heb. vi. 2. as well as elſewhere, and as every real believer has ſome degree of hope, which makes him reſt and rely on Chriſt alone for ſalvation as he is offered in the goſpel, ſo perhaps there are not very many who have ſuch a degree of ſteady and firm aſſurance, as to exclude all doubting. I know there are ſome that have taken it up as a principle, and make aſſurance, even in this reflex ſenſe, the eſſence of faith; but when it comes to experience, except the phraſeology itſelf, I do not find they differ much from others.

I mentioned to you particularly, ſtrictneſs and tenderneſs of practice. This is of the utmoſt moment, as the fruit and evidence of real religion. All principles are valuable, but as they produce practice. But to explain ſtrictneſs and tenderneſs of practice a little, obſerve, that the expreſſion of tenderneſs, is borrowed from that paſſage of ſcripture, found in 2 Kings xxii. 19. 2 Chron. iii. 4. where of Joſiah it is ſaid, "becauſe thine heart was tender," &c. it ſignifies a heart eaſily ſuſceptible of conviction, and obedient to reproof. When this is applied to the carriage of one devoted to the ſervice of the miniſtry, I think it implies, 1. the ſtricteſt watchfulneſs to diſcover ſin and duty, and a diſpoſition to obey the dictates of conſcience with reſpect to both. 2. A concern to avoid, not only what is

in itself directly and certainly sinful, but whatever is but doubtful according to the apostolic doctrine, "he that doubteth," &c. 3. A willingness to abstain from lawful things, if liable to exception, or likely to be matter of offence.

II. A second advice I would give you upon this subject is, that you should remember the importance of the exercises of piety, and the duties of the closet. As there are no forms of prayer with us, the habit of closet devotion is necessary to give a minister fullness, propriety, and fervency in prayer. This for his own sake, also, he should attend to, for it is necessary to the preservation and improvement of the spiritual life. Pray without ceasing, says the apostle, intimating that the very spirit and temper of a believer, should be that of dependance upon God, and deriving by faith from him, every necessary supply. In order to recommend it particularly to you, I would observe, that it is peculiarly necessary to be begun in early life; perhaps there are few, if any instances of persons coming to a greater degree of fervour in devotion, or attention to the duty of it, in advanced years, than they had in youth. There are many particulars, in which an aged, if a real Christian, will insensibly improve: he will improve in meekness and humility, in prudence and judgment, in attention to Providence, in purity of principle, in submission to the divine will; but fervour in devotion must be begun early, while the passions are strong, and continued by the power of reason and habit. Perhaps you may think it of small moment, yet some very judicious and experienced Christians have given it as a rule upon this subject, to be strictly punctual and regular in point of time, and even place.

III. Early fix, and study under the influence of those principles, which should animate all your future labours, a concern for the glory of God, and love for the souls of men. If these are the principles of study, they will keep you from mistaking the way, and having taken early and deep root, they will bring forth fruit more abundantly in after life. Living by faith, is extremely proper for cultivating these principles. Keeping the whole system of revealed truth in view, will shew its moment; and particu-

larly what is revealed concerning the eternal condition of men, cannot fail to fill us with a concern for their welfare.

IV. Be diligent to acquire every neceſſary qualification; and yet ſtudy ſelf-denial in the uſe of them: this is one of the moſt important, and at the ſame time, one of the moſt difficult attainments. It is comparatively eaſy to avoid vain glory, if at the ſame time we indulge in ſloth and negligence. But to meditate upon theſe things, to give ourſelves wholly to them, for the glory of God and the good of ſouls, without having it in view to ſerve ourſelves, this is real excellence, and here lies the greateſt difficulty. Form yourſelves to a true taſte and real knowledge; let your capacity want no improvement that it may be more uſeful, but beware of ſtudying only to ſhine.

V. Laſtly, guard againſt the temptation that is moſt incident to your ſtate and ſituation, particularly, making the exerciſes of piety and the ordinances of the goſpel matter of ſcience and criticiſm, rather than the means of edification. When ſtudents begin to learn how things ought to be done, they are apt at all times to be paſſing their judgment of the manner, inſtead of improving the matter of public inſtruction; not that it is poſſible to be wholly inattentive to this, but let it not carry you ſo much away, as to hinder your teaching others as humble Chriſtians, as well as diſcourſing to them as able miniſters.

LECTURE II.

LET us now conſider learning as an important qualification of a miniſter. On this ſubject, after ſaying a few things on its moment, I ſhall endeavour to point out to you what branches of ſtudy it will be your intereſt to apply yourſelves to, with greateſt diligence. As to

the importance of learning, there being no reaſon for us in this age to expect immediate or ſupernatural revelation, the acquiring a proper meaſure of knowledge by ſtudy and application, is abſolutely neceſſary. No parts or capacity are ſufficient without this; nay, ſuch is the wiſe order of Providence, that to improve a talent is to poſſeſs and ſecure it—to neglect it, is to loſe it. There is ſcarce any thing that a man could once do ever ſo well, but if he lay aſide the practice, he will loſe the faculty. It is lamentable to think what a poor and contemptible figure ſome perſons make in advanced life, who had good talents from nature, but ſuffered them to ruſt in ſloth, or to be blunted by ſenſuality and ſelf-indulgence. Learning is neceſſary to keep the ſacred truths we are obliged to handle, from contempt. Great weakneſs and inſufficiency expoſe the miniſtry to contempt, even amongſt the meaneſt of the people; but it is eſpecially a ſtumbling block to thoſe who are themſelves perſons of literature and taſte. It is extremely difficult for them to receive and reliſh things delivered in a mean, ſlovenly manner. Suppoſe, for example, one who is not ſo much as ſenſible of the groſſeſt improprieties of ſtile, ſpeaking in the hearing of perſons of rank, or of real knowledge: and as even a good man is not always wholly free from vanity and affectation—ſuppoſe too that the ſpeaker ſhould ſwell his diſcourſe with high and pompous phraſes, or hard, and out of the way ſcientific terms—only think how great would be the temptation, to ſuch perſons as I have mentioned, not to neglect what is good, from its being mixed with what they ſo juſtly deſpiſe. Learning is alſo neceſſary to repel the attacks of adverſaries. The goſpel has never been without enemies from without, and from within; and as it is uſually by means of human learning that they make the attack, it is neceſſary that ſome ſhould be ready to meet them, and able to unravel the ſubtilty with which they lie in wait to receive. I have often thought that there was ſomething very admirable in the choice our Saviour made of his firſt miniſters, to aſſiſt us in adjuſting our views upon this ſubject. for the more immediate

manifeſtation of divine power, when the wiſe and great in the world were united againſt his truths, he choſe twelve illiterate fiſhermen, which ſhould teach us not to over-rate the wiſdom of the wiſe; and leſt in after ages we ſhould be tempted to under-rate it, he choſe one apoſtle, able and learned, and to him he gave the moſt ſignal ſucceſs; ſo that he laboured more abundantly than them all, and was honoured to be the penman of a very conſiderable part of the code of the New Teſtament.

But let me now proceed to conſider what branches of ſtudy it will be your intereſt to apply to with the greateſt diligence; and if I am able to do this with propriety, I am perſuaded you will find it of the moſt ſignal ſervice. A traveller loſes time upon his journey by going out of the road, as well as by ſtanding ſtill; and if his direction is very wrong, the time is more than loſt, for his diſtance is increaſed, and his ſtrength is exhauſted. On this ſubject be pleaſed to attend to the following remarks. There is no branch of literature without its uſe. If it were poſſible for a miniſter to be acquainted with every branch of ſcience, he would be more fit for public uſefulneſs. The underſtanding which God hath given us, and every object that he hath preſented to it, may be improved to his glory. A truly good man does grow both in holineſs and uſefulneſs, by every new diſcovery that is made to him; therefore learning in general is to be eſteemed, acquired, and improved; and perhaps I may alſo ſay, it were therefore good if a miniſter were a perſon of extenſive knowledge. But our time and capacity are both limited, and we cannot do all that we could wiſh. On the ſubject of literature in general, obſerve, that reading a few books well choſen, and digeſting them thoroughly, together with the frequent exerciſe of reflection, will make a knowing and intelligent man: but to make what the world calls a learned man, or a great ſcholar, requires a very general knowledge of authors, books and opinions of all kinds. A perſon of great diſcernment may perhaps obſerve a ſtill nicer diſtinction, in the uſe of epithets in our own language. The phraſe "a man of learning," according to its preſent acceptation in Europe, almoſt always ſuppoſes and in-

cludes, taſte in the belles lettres. A great ſcholar, or a man of erudition, always carries in it the idea of much reading: the firſt always ſuppoſes genius, the other may conſiſt with very moderate talents. A pretty large circle of the ſciences is taught in our ſchools and colleges; and though many think it too extenſive, yet ſomething of the principles of the whole may be underſtood by a perſon of capacity and diligence: his knowledge may be true and juſt, though not minute. A man may not be a mathematician or an aſtronomer, and yet underſtand ſomething of the true ſyſtem of the univerſe. He may underſtand many ſciences ſo far as to comprehend the reaſoning of thoſe more deeply ſkilled, who ſpeak and write of them, and ſo as to ſpeak with politeneſs and conſiſtency within his own line, in every thing he ſays of them. But to excel in any particular branch of ſcience, and to know every thing upon that branch that may be known, is the work of a life-time. Grammar, mathematics, aſtronomy, oratory, hiſtory, law, phyſic, poetry, painting, ſtatuary, architecture, muſic; nay, the ſubordinate diviſions of ſome of theſe ſciences, ſuch as, anatomy, botany, chymiſtry, are all of them ſufficient to employ a life, to carry them to perfection. It is therefore plainly in itſelf improbable, that almoſt any man can attain a high degree of perfection in all, or indeed in many of theſe branches of ſtudy. There is even ſomething more to be obſerved; the perſon who addicts himſelf to any one of thoſe ſtudies, ſo as to be an adept, or really a complete maſter in it, cannot be a man of extenſive knowledge; and it is but ſeldom that he can be a man of a liberal or noble turn of mind, becauſe his time is conſumed by the peculiarities, and his mind narrowed by attending to one particular art. He is likewiſe apt to eſteem his favourite ſtudy ſo much as to confine all excellence, and even all capacity, to it. A profound botaniſt, ſmitten with the love of flowers and herbs, if he meets with a man that does not know one from another, and does not value a ranunculus or anemone more than a pile of common ſpear-graſs, has a ſovereign contempt of ſuch an underſtanding. Dean Swift takes notice of a curious expreſſion this way,

of a dancing-master, at whose school the famous Harley, Earl of Oxford, had been in his youth; when he was made secretary of state, he said, he wondered what the Queen could see in that man, for he was one of the greatest dunces he ever taught.

Hence you may observe, that all who are devoted to the particular study of one small branch, are generally considered as pedants; and indeed commonly are such as are understood by that expression. Their thoughts have taken such a course, and their ideas themselves taken such a tincture from their favourite study, that they see every thing through that medium, and are apt to introduce the expressions belonging to it, upon every subject and occasion. Mr. Addison in one of his Spectators observes, that every man whose knowledge is confined to one particular subject is a pedant, as a mere soldier, a mere actor, a mere merchant, &c. but that the learned pedant, though generally most laughed at, is of all others the most tolerable, because he has generally something to communicate that is worth hearing. But I observe, that the most reasonable pedants, and the least to be blamed, are those whose whole hearts are set upon what is their business for life. Therefore, though a schoolmaster can scarcely speak without citing Virgil or Horace, he is to be indulged; and though he may not make the most distinguished figure in public or polite life, yet he is useful in his generation, and fit for the discharge of his trust.—Therefore, a minister that is a mere theologian, well acquainted with the scriptures, though with few other books, or books upon other subjects, and is master of the controversies that belong to divinity, properly so called, is certainly much more to be pardoned, than one ever so much skilled in any other science without this. But what shall we say of those, who mistake their duty so very much, as to be chiefly distinguished for that which they have least to do with. I have known a physician, who was a much greater connoisseur in music than in medicine; and a divine, much more famous for accounts and calculation, than for preaching. It is therefore, in my opinion, not any honor to a minister to be very famous in any branch that is wholly uncon-

nected with theology; not that knowledge of any thing, properly ſpeaking, is either a diſadvantage or ground of reproach; but for a man to ſhow a deep knowledge of ſome particular ſubject, plainly diſcovers that he hath beſtowed more time and pains upon it, than he had to ſpare from his neceſſary duty. It is alſo uſual in all ſuch caſes, that the favourite purſuit infuſes ſuch a quantity of phraſes and alluſions into his language, as render it ſtiff and improper, and ſometimes ridiculous.

Agreeably to theſe remarks I obſerve, that the aſſiſtant ſtudies to theology, are chiefly the following: 1. Languages. 2. Moral Philoſophy. 3. Hiſtory, ſacred and profane. 4. Eloquence, including the belles lettres ſtudy in general.

I. Languages. Theſe indeed, uſed to be reckoned eſſentially neceſſary to learning in general, immediately after the revival of learning in Europe: The Greek and Latin languages were ſtudied univerſally, and with great care. All authors who expected their works ſhould live any time, wrote in Latin; but ſince the cultivation of the languages of Europe, this has been gradually diſcontinued, and except in ſome few ſcientific writings, have now wholly ceaſed. However, as the remains of the ancients are ſtill the ſtandard of taſte, all literary perſons ſhould make themſelves acquainted with the languages. It is to be lamented that many ſpend a great part of the time of their education in learning Latin and Greek, and yet few ever attain them to that perfection, which alone can make the learning of a language of great moment, ſo that they can read the authors with pleaſure and profit, for the matter which they contain. This might be eaſily attained by almoſt any ſtudent after his grammar ſchool and other education; and reading over the claſſics with ſome of the beſt critics upon them, would be a very improving ſtudy. Books of hiſtory and entertainment alſo, in Greek and Latin, would have a happy effect this way. The Hebrew language alſo, is very proper and uſeful for a divine, being the language in which a great part of the ſcriptures were originally written, and not difficult to acquire, becauſe we have but few writings in that language

at all, and the language itſelf is not copious: to theſe I only add the ſtudy of the French language; it is both uſeful and ornamental. There is hardly any ſuch thing as a learned education in Britain, where the French language is omitted. It was the firſt poliſhed of all the modern languages of Europe, having been at leaſt fifty years before the Engliſh in this reſpect; and though there are ſome branches of writing in which there are Engliſh authors not inferior to any of the French that I am acquainted with; yet in general, there is to be found a greater purity, ſimplicity and preciſion, in the French authors, than in the Engliſh. But what indeed chiefly diſpoſes me to recommend the French language to divines is on account of the ſound, calviniſtic, reformation divinity: there are many more able and elegant writers in that language, than in Engliſh; there are alſo ſome admirable practical treatiſes written by the popiſh divines in French, as well as by the Janſeniſts of the Roman catholic communion: Janſeniſts and Moliniſts in the church of Rome, are juſt the ſame as Caliſts and Arminians among proteſtants.

II. Moral Philoſophy. The connexion of this with divinity will be eaſily ſeen. It is a very pleaſant and improving ſtudy in itſelf, or a good handmaid to the chriſtian morality; and the controverſies upon that ſubject, which are all modern, ſtand in immediate connexion with the deiſtical controverſies, which it is neceſſary for a divine to make himſelf maſter of. There are few of the ancient writers of much value upon that ſubject, excepting Plato among the Greeks, and Cicero among the Latins, eſpecially the latter. The remains of Socrates (to be collected from the writers of his country, but chiefly from Xenophon,) the works of Epictetus, Marcus Antoninus, and Seneca, contain many moral ſentiments, but little or nothing of the principles of morals. I think the moſt beautiful moral writer of the ancients, is the author of the Tablature of Cebes. As to any thing contained in the ancients, relative to the truth of Theology, it will be found almoſt univerſally collected in Cudworth's intellectual ſyſtem.

III. Hiſtory, ſacred and profane. This is a ſtudy, eaſy, pleaſant and profitable, and by a peculiar happineſs of

this age, fashionable. As a clergyman should be a man of liberal knowledge, and fit for the conversation and society of men of rank and letters, it is necessary that he be well acquainted with history; if he is not, he will be often ready to betray his ignorance before persons who should be much his inferiors in point of study: besides you see a great part of the sacred writings, both of the Old Testament and the New, consists of history; and few things are more necessary to the just and critical study of the scriptures than an acquaintance with history, with the original state and gradual progress of human society; it adds greatly too, to a minister's knowledge of the human heart; in that respect it may be said to be the way to that knowledge of the world which may be obtained at least expence and with perfect safety.

IV. Lastly, Eloquence; that is to say, composition and criticism, including the whole of what is commonly called the belles lettres study. Nothing is more plain than the necessity of this science: public speaking is to be the chief, or one of the chief parts, of a minister's business for life. I shall not enlarge on this, having occasion to speak on it at great length in another department, which you have had, or may have, an opportunity to hear. I should have made more mention of books, but as I have written, at the particular desire of some of the last year's scholars, a list of the principal and most valuable writers in every branch of science, it will be more complete, for any that desire it, to have copies of that list.

LECTURE III.

THE subject on which we are now to enter, is the truth of the Christian religion. I am sensible that every good man has a conviction of the truth of the gospel from its power and efficacy upon his own heart, distinct from, and superior to, all speculative reasoning. That deep and

heart-felt ſenſe of the corruption and weakneſs of our nature, and of the power of indwelling ſin, which is inſeparable from the reality of religion, and the perception of the admirable fitneſs of redemption by the croſs to abaſe the pride of man, and to exalt the grace of God; to give conſolation to the ſinner, while it changes the heart; is highly ſatisfying to a conſiderate, if at the ſame time, a ſerious perſon; ſo that for his own ſake, he would pay but little regard to all the fooliſh cavils of men of corrupt minds: nay, there is ſomething more; the whole ſyſtem of the goſpel, as depending upon, and having conſtant reference to the croſs, is ſo contrary to the taſte of a carnal mind, and ſo far from carrying in it any of the marks of human wiſdom that it is impoſſible to ſuppoſe it a cunningly deviſed fable, and therefore we may cordially embrace and rely upon it, as the power of God into ſalvation. One thing more I would ſay, by way of introduction; that the cuſtom of ſome miniſters, of conſtantly entertaining their hearers with a refutation of infidel objections upon every ſubject, is not much to be commended. This ſeems to proceed upon a ſuppoſition, that a great part of their audience is inclined to infidelity. There are times and places when that is proper I admit; but there are many others in which it is either quite unneceſſary, or even hurtful, as tending to bring people acquainted with what would perhaps never otherwiſe have fallen in their way. It is however certain, that ſince in modern times eſpecially, this controverſy has been greatly agitated, and indeed of late almoſt all other controverſies have been dropped on account of it, or loſt in it; a ſtudent of divinity ſhould be well informed upon it. I will therefore endeavour to ſtate it to you with as much diſtinctneſs as I am able, and as much brevity as its nature will admit. The ſubject muſt be taken up a little differently, as we ſuppoſe we have to do with different adverſaries—atheiſts and theiſts.

The controverſy with the firſt, perhaps it is unneceſſary to treat with much length, becauſe it is not difficult, and becauſe there are but few that plead the cauſe of infidelity upon this footing, yet ſome of the lateſt infidel writers,

particularly David Hume, has raiſed ſuch objections, as ſeem chiefly to point this way. The boundleſs ſcepticiſm he has endeavoured to introduce, would weaken the belief we have in the Deity, as much as in the goſpel; and indeed, as he ſeldom attacks particulars, (except in the caſe of miracles) his enmity ſeems to be againſt religion in general, and not againſt the goſpel: the ſame thing may be ſaid of Voltaire, Helvetius, and other foreigners; though Voltaire deals very much in particular cavils, and of the moſt ſilly kind.

In the deiſtical controverſy, what commonly leads the way, is the neceſſity of revelation in general. This is to be proved from the ſtate of the heathen world, before the coming of Chriſt. The chief circumſtances to be taken notice of, are, 1. Their groſs ignorance. 2 Their abſurd notions of God, as of human ſhape, with many paſſions, and the worſt of vices. 3. Their impious and ſhocking rites, particularly human ſacrifices. 4. Their polytheiſm, and multiplicity of gods. 5. Their great immorality. It is to be particularly obſerved, that theſe things were not confined to the barbarous nations, but if there was any difference, it was rather more eminently the caſe with thoſe who were thought the moſt improved and civilized, the Egyptians, Greeks and Romans. The firſt infidel writers in Europe, were chiefly employed in ſhewing the ſufficiency of reaſon as a guide to man in his conduct, of whom Lord Herbert, of Cherburg, was one of the moſt early, and one of the moſt eminent. Their way of arguing is very fallacious; for they avail themſelves of that very improvement of reaſon, which they owe to revelation, in order to ſhew revelation to be unneceſſary. The ſublime and noble conceptions of God, as the father of ſpirits, which after they are diſcovered, can eaſily be ſhewn to be rational, are boaſted of as the productions of unbiaſſed reaſon; but the fair way of deciding the queſtion is to apply to thoſe nations that wanted revelation, that is to ſay, the Jewiſh and Chriſtian revelation, and there we ſhall ſee what reaſon, in the courſe of many ages, was able to do in fact. There is likewiſe more here than is commonly attended to; for there is the greateſt probability

that the ſmall meaſure of truth which was mixed with the heathen fables, was not the diſcovery of reaſon, but handed down by traditions. It is well known that the Egyptian theology, and their literature, whatever it was, was kept a ſecret, and was handed down from one to another by their prieſts, and it is as certain that the earlieſt Grecian philoſophers never expected that they could, nor pretended that they had, diſcovered any of their opinions by reaſon, but they travelled to Egypt, and the Eaſtern countries, and brought it home, as information which they had received from the ſages of thoſe countries. This was the caſe of Thales in particular, and after him of Pythagoras. Several ingenious writers have endeavoured to ſhew that the heathen mythology contains, in many reſpects, a partial and adulterated view of the ſcripture hiſtory: ſee on this ſubject, Abbe Banier's mythology of the ancients, with regard to the Greeks and Romans, and Abbe Pluche's hiſtory of the heavens, with regard to the Egyptians.

But with regard to the neceſſity of revelation in general, what ſeems particularly deciſive is, that by a fair examination of the matter, and the univerſal conſent of all nations, men in a ſtate of nature are chargeable with guilt. Whatever may be ſaid either of original ſin, or inherent pollution, it cannot be denied that there is much moral evil in the world. So true is this, that the hiſtory of the world is little elſe than the hiſtory of human guilt. They that would evade this, by ſaying men are only imperfect, do not obſerve that they are guilty of ſuch crimes as are ſtrongly condemned by their own reaſon and conſcience. Now, whether there is any forgiveneſs of ſin and place for repentance; and if at all, upon what terms, can never be determined but by an expreſs revelation. This is implied in the nature of guilt. Guilt is a liableneſs to juſt puniſhment: now, whether God will remit a puniſhment which he may inflict with juſtice, muſt reſt ultimately with himſelf, and no reaſoning can decide upon it. Try it who will, every argument brought in favour of the remiſſion, will militate againſt the juſtice of the puniſhment. This appears from the very language of perſons diſpoſed to ſuch ſentiments, for they cannot help ſaying,

and indeed they have nothing elſe to ſay, but that it is probable, for it would be *hard* to ſuppoſe that every tranſgreſſion ſhould be puniſhed with divine vengeance: but pray let us conſider this way of ſpeaking; where is the hardſhip? Is juſtice hard? On the contrary, it is glorious and amiable. I confeſs it is difficult for us ſinful creatures to confeſs, and ſtill more difficult from the heart to believe, that every ſin deſerves God's wrath and curſe, both in this life and that which is to come; it is however the neceſſary conſequence, not of one, but of the whole ſyſtem of ſcripture truths. There you have in every page, the higheſt encomiums upon the mercy and compaſſion of God. Theſe are all without meaning, and contrary to truth, if it would have been the leaſt impeachment of the righteouſneſs of God to have ſuffered the penalty to take place. Pardon, if the word is underſtood, muſt be free. Benignity and goodneſs to the innocent, is a part of the character of the Deity in natural religion: but mercy to the guilty, belongs wholly to revelation. Accordingly, it is upon this point, that all the heathen religions have turned. Expiation ſeems to have been the great purpoſe of all religion, whether true or falſe. "Wherewith ſhall I come before the Lord?" &c. The neceſſity of revelation was acknowledged by many of the heathens in their writings. Of theſe, the ſaying of Socrates to Alcibiades was a remarkable example, that it was reaſonable to expect God would ſend one into the world to deliver men from ignorance and error, and bring them to the knowledge of himſelf.

LECTURE IV.

On the Truth of the Christian Religion.

HAVING endeavoured to eſtabliſh the truth of revelation in general, we come to the truth of the Chriſtian religion in particular. The proofs of this are ſo many, and laid down ſo differently, according as the adverſaries of the truth have ſhifted their ground, that it is impoſſible to enumerate them, and indeed not eaſy to claſs them. There is one introductory way of reaſoning, which may be called comparative—to reflect on the infinite difference between the Chriſtian, and all other pretended revelations. If the neceſſity of revelation has been properly and fully eſtabliſhed, then compariſons between the ſeveral pretences to it ſeem to be juſt, and even concluſive. Now I think it does not admit of heſitation, that with reſpect to purity, conſiſtency, ſublimity, dignity, and every excellence which a manifeſtation of the true God muſt be ſuppoſed to have, the Chriſtian religion is ſuperior to every other. The heathen ſuperſtitions have not now ſo much as an advocate. Infidels do not now plead for Jupiter, Juno, Mars, and Apollo, but for the ſufficiency of human reaſon: and indeed, an age or two after the publication of the goſpel, that whole corrupt ſyſtem which had been ſupported ſo long by ignorance and credulity, fell to the ground.

Paſſing from this detached and preliminary conſideration, the proofs of the Chriſtian religion are very commonly divided into evidence *internal* and *external*. By the firſt of theſe we are to underſtand the excellency of the doctrine, as agreeable to the dictates of reaſon and conſcience, and having a tendency to produce the happieſt effects. Under this head alſo comes the character of the founder of the Chriſtian faith, and every thing connected with this or the former particular. By the external evi-

dence, we are to underſtand the miracles wrought in atteſtation of the truth of the doctrine; the nature and ſubject of theſe miracles, the credibility of the witneſſes, and every thing neceſſary to ſupport this teſtimony. It is difficult however, to collect the evidence under thoſe heads, without often intermixing the one with the other. I have therefore thought the evidences of the truth of the Chriſtian religion, might be as well divided in a different way. Firſt, into two heads under the following titles; 1. Collateral, and 2. Direct and poſitive proof. And again to divide the collateral into two parts, and take the one of them before, and the other after the direct evidence, under the titles of *presumptive* and *consequential*.

I. Let us conſider the preſumptive evidences of the truth of the Chriſtian religion, or thoſe circumſtances that recommend it to our eſteem and love, and are of the nature of ſtrong probabilities in its favour. Theſe we may, for order ſake, divide into ſuch as relate, 1. To the doctrine taught. 2. The perſon who is the author and ſubject of it. 3. The circumſtances attending its publication, and other probabilities.

1. The doctrine taught. When this is conſidered in the way of an argument for its actual truth, it reſts upon this principle, that every doctrine that comes from God muſt be excellent; that therefore, if the doctrine did not appear of itſelf to be excellent, it would be rejected without further examination, becauſe not worthy of God; and on the contrary, that if it appears excellent, amiable, uſeful, it is ſome preſumption that the claim of a divine original, is juſt. It is a juſt reflection on Chriſt's doctrine, never man ſpake like this man, as well as the following, no man can do the miracles that thou doſt, except God be with him. Under this great head of excellence, or a doctrine worthy of God, may be conſidered ſeparately—1. Its Sublimity. 2. Purity. 3. Efficacy. 4 Plainneſs. 5. Conſiſtency.

1. Sublimity. The doctrines contained in ſcripture concerning God, his works, and creatures, and his relation to them, is what muſt neceſſarily have the approbation of unprejudiced reaſon, and indeed is the moſt noble that

can be conceived. His ſpiritual nature infinitely removed from inactive matter, incapable of groſſneſs, and of ſenſual indulgence. The unity of God, ſo contrary to the prevailing ſentiments under heatheniſh darkneſs, yet how manifeſtly rational. Strange, indeed, that the whole world ſhould have been in a miſtake on this ſubject, and the Jews, a deſpiſed nation, in an obſcure corner of Paleſtine, ſhould alone have diſcovered and embraced it. The immenſity of God filling heaven and earth with his preſence. His omnipotence in creating all things by his word. His holineſs, juſtice, goodneſs and truth: to theſe we may add the conſtant influence of his providence, as the Lord of nature, the witneſs and the judge of all. Very beautifully the prophet ſays, "can any of the vanities of the Gentiles cauſe rain;" ſo the apoſtle Paul, "nevertheleſs he left not himſelf without a witneſs," &c. The moral government of God, as taught in ſcripture, is exceedingly rational and ſatisfying, repreſenting his great patience and long-ſuffering, to be followed by a time of holy and righteous retribution. The mixture of good and evil that is plainly to be obſerved, is by this means clearly explained, and fully accounted for. On the ſublimity of the ſcripture doctrines, ſome are fond of dwelling upon the majeſty of God, and the ſublimity of the ſcriptures in ſentiment and language, as well as matter. Upon this part of the ſubject, things have been ſaid, and the controverſy taken up, on different footings. We have one adverſary to religion, Lord Shaftſbury, who has been at much pains to vilify the ſcriptures on the ſubject of ſtile and compoſition, and to pretend, that if it were the work of inſpired writers, it would be evidently, in its manner, ſuperior to every human production. In anſwer to this pretence, there was a book written, Blackwall's Sacred Claſſics, comparing the ſcriptures with the ancient writers, and ſhewing that there is not any blemiſh in writing to be found in the ſcriptures, but may be juſtified by ſimilar expreſſions in the moſt approved claſſics, and that there is no beauty in the claſſic authors, in which they are not outdone by the ſacred penmen. This book I think is well worth reading by every ſcholar or di-

vine. Dr. Warburton has been pleaſed to condemn this way of juſtifying the ſcriptures, and even to affirm, that taſte is a thing ſo local and variable, that it was a thing impoſſible to have any book deſigned for all mankind, to anſwer ſuch an idea as Lord Shaftſbury ſeems to have formed; nay, he ſeems to deny that there is any ſuch thing in nature as a permanent ſtandard of taſte and propriety in writing; but that there is one manner for the Oriental, and another for the Weſtern writers, and that ſuch have their excellencies, and no compariſon can take place between them. I would not chooſe to join wholly with either of theſe. It is I think plain, that it was not the deſign of the ſcriptures to be a ſtandard for eloquence, nor does it appear any way connected with the end of revealing divine truth; on the contrary, it ſeems to be the purpoſe of God, to bring us from glorying in human excellence. On the other hand, as I am perſuaded there is a permanent ſtandard of propriety and taſte, ſo I am fully convinced there are many examples of ſublimity and majeſty in the ſcriptures, ſuperior to any uninſpired writings whatſoever.

2. The next thing to be obſerved of the doctrine, is its purity; that is to ſay, having an evident tendency to promote holineſs in all who believe and embrace it. That this is the deſign and tendency of the Chriſtian doctrine, is very plain. It is its expreſs purpoſe, to ſet ſin and immorality in the moſt odious light, and not barely to recommend, but to ſhew the abſolute neceſſity of holineſs, in all manner of converſation. It is pretended by ſome infidel writers, that gravity and apparent ſanctity, is the eſſence of impoſtors, and that all impoſtors do deliver a ſyſtem of good morals. But there is not only one excellence in the Chriſtian morals, but a manifeſt ſuperiority in them, to thoſe which are derived from any other ſource, and that in three reſpects: 1. That they are free from mixture, not only many things good, but nothing of a contrary kind. 2. That there are precepts in the Chriſtian morality, and thoſe of the moſt excellent kind, very little, if any thing reſembling which, is to be found in uninſpired moraliſts. The love of God—humility of mind—the forgiveneſs of injuries—and the love of our enemies.

The love of God may be inferred conſequentially, from many of the heathen writers; but it is no where ſtated with that propriety and fullneſs as the firſt obligation on the creature, as it is in the ſacred ſcriptures. Humility of mind, as repreſented in the goſpel, is wholly peculiar to it. It is obſerved by ſome, that there is no word, neither in the Greek nor Latin languages, to ſignify it. *Humilitas* in Latin, from whence the Engliſh is derived, has a different meaning, and ſignifies low and baſe. *Mansuetudo animi* in Latin, and *Praotces* in Greek, are the neareſt to it, but are far from being that; even the forgiveneſs of injuries and the love of our enemies, are rather contrary to the heathen virtue; and modern infidels have expreſsly pretended that the Chriſtian religion, by its precepts of humility and meekneſs and paſſive ſubmiſſion to injury, has baniſhed that heroiſm and magnanimity which gives ſuch an air of dignity to the hiſtories of Greece and Rome. The third particular, in which the Chriſtian morals exceed all others, is the excellence of the principle from which they ought to flow. The law of God is not contracted into governing the outward conduct, but reaches to the very heart, and requires further that our obedience ſhould flow, not principally from a regard to our own happineſs, far leſs to our own honour, but from a principle of ſubjection in the creature to the Creator, and a ſingle eye to the glory of God.

III. The excellence of the ſcripture doctrine appears from its *efficacy*. By this I mean the power it hath over the mind, and its actual influence in producing that holineſs it recommends; there are ſeveral things that deſerve conſideration on the efficacy of the ſcripture doctrine. 1. It contains the greateſt and moſt powerful motives to duty, and the fitteſt to work on our hopes and fears. Theſe, I confeſs, are much the ſame in general that always have been propoſed as inducements to a moral conduct, yet they are opened with a fullneſs and force in the ſcripture no where elſe to be found. Eternity there makes a very awful appearance. Particularly with reſpect to the goſpel and the New Teſtament diſcoveries, we are told that life and immortality are brought to light by them.

2. It carries the greateſt authority with it; the principles of duty are more clearly and fully enforced by the proper authority, than any where elſe; the right of God, from creation, to the obedience and ſubmiſſion of his creatures, his additional title from continual beneficence, to which ought to be added, by Chriſtians, the right acquired by redemption; to all which is further to be added, the divine nature itſelf, as our pattern. 3. The effectual aſſiſtance, provided in the ſcripture doctrine, to deliver us from the bondage of corruption and bring us to the glorious liberty of the children of God; this is of more conſequence than is commonly apprehended; deſpair of ſucceſs breaks the powers of the mind, and takes away at once the will to attempt and the power to perform, whereas effectual aid has juſt the oppoſite effect. The doctrine of the Holy Spirit, taking it ſingly in this view, is moſt happily calculated to animate men to diligence, and inſpire them with courage and reſolution, and ſeems generally to ſhew the efficacy of the Chriſtian doctrine.

IV. Another excellence of the Chriſtian doctrine is plainneſs; it is level to all capacities, well fitted for all ranks, rich and poor, wiſe and unwiſe. It is given as one of the marks of the Meſſiah's coming, and is one of the glories of the goſpel, that it is preached to the poor. Religion was plainly deſigned for all mankind, their intereſt in it is the ſame; therefore it muſt be plain and ſimple; whatever is otherwiſe, whatever ſyſtem is built upon abſtract reaſoning, and is evidently above the comprehenſion of the vulgar, is, for that very reaſon, unfit for their ſervice, and carries a mark of falſehood upon itſelf. There is even ſomething more in the ſimplicity of the goſpel, than barely the plainneſs of its truths and duties. It is from firſt to laſt founded upon facts ſtill plainer. A great part of the inſpired writings is hiſtory; the Old Teſtament is founded upon the fall of man, and is filled up with the hiſtory of Providence, or God's conduct to his choſen people; and the New Teſtament contains the birth, life, and death, the reſurrection and aſcenſion of Chriſt. So material a part of the doctrine do theſe things compriſe, that the character of the apoſtles is juſt that of being witneſſes

of Chriſt's reſurrection. 5. The laſt excellence to be taken notice of in the Chriſtian doctrine, is its conſiſtency. This conſiſtency may be viewed to advantage in two different lights; firſt, its conſiſtency with itſelf. It is remarkable that the Chriſtian revelation is not a ſingle ſyſtem that was, or might be ſuppoſed to be, the occaſional production of one man. It extends from the creation, downwards, to the preſent moment, or rather, taking in the prophecies, to the laſt day and conſummation of all things. It conſiſts of ſeveral different revelations, and particularly, two grand different diſpenſations of providence and grace. The one of theſe is perfectly conſiſtent with, and ſuited to the other. It is not eaſy to ſuppoſe an impoſtor either willing to perform, or able to execute, any thing of that kind. But when we conſider the creation, and the fall of the Old Teſtament diſpenſation, and the prophets of the different and diſtant ages, conſpiring to forward one great deſign, and the appearance of the long promiſed Saviour, at the fullneſs of time, ſo exactly correſponding to it, it takes away the poſſibility of a concert, and therefore the ſuſpicions of an impoſtor. It is alſo conſiſtent with the actual ſtate of the world, in which we find two things very remarkable. 1. A great depravity, and wickedneſs. Men may ſpeak and write what they pleaſe, upon the beauty, excellence, and dignity of human nature, taking their ideas from the dictates of conſcience, as to what we ought to be. But it is beyond all controverſy, that if we take mankind from the faithful records of hiſtory, and examine what they have been, we ſhall have no great reaſon to admire the beauty of the picture. What is the fame of the greateſt heroes of antiquity? Is it not that either of conquerors or law-givers? Conquerors give clear teſtimony to the wickedneſs of man, by filling the earth with blood, and ſhewing us what havock has been made in all ages, of man by man. And what is it that law-givers have done, but diſtinguiſhed themſelves by the beſt means of repelling violence and reſtraining the ungoverned luſts and appetites of men. Now the Chriſtian religion is the only one that gives a clear and conſiſtent account of human depravity, and traces it to its very

original ſource. This conſiſtency of the doctrines of religion with the actual ſtate of the world, and preſent condition of the nature of man, is very convincing in the way of collateral or preſumptive proof. The other particular remarkable in the ſtate of the world, is, the univerſal prevalence of the offering of ſacrifices, a thing found among all nations, and which continued till the coming of Chriſt. Theſe ſacrifices were a confeſſion of guilt, for they were always conſidered as an expiation. But beſides this, it does not appear how they could have occurred, even in that view, unleſs they had been at firſt a matter of revelation, and handed down to mankind by tradition, and carried with them in their diſperſion over the whole world. It does not appear how any body could have imagined, that taking away the life of a beaſt ſhould be any atonement for the ſin of a man; much leſs does it appear how every body ſhould have agreed in imagining that ſame thing. But if you take it in conjunction with the truths of the goſpel, its agreement appears manifeſt, and its univerſal prevalence is eaſily accounted for. Theſe ſacrifices were inſtituted and ordained of God, as typical of the great propitiatory ſacrifice to be offered in the fullneſs of time, by Chriſt upon the croſs.

LECTURE V.

2. WE proceed now to the ſecond branch of this head, to conſider the preſumptive proof of the truth of the Chriſtian religion, ariſing from the perſon who is the founder of it. He is indeed not only the founder of it, but the ſubject of it: for the whole may be ſaid to relate to his perſon and undertaking. For order ſake, let us here conſider ſeparately, 1. His character. 2. His ſituation and hopes. 3. The ſpirit of his religion. 4. The meaſures he took to promote it,

I. His character.—This as painted in the gospels, in their simple, unaffected, and therefore probably genuine narratives, is truly admirable—the most meek and gentle, the most tender-hearted, the most truly benevolent, and active without ostentation, and the whole crowned and illustrated by fortitude and patience, and the most unconditional subjection to divine Providence. It is unnecessary to go through, at length the various excellencies that adorned the man Christ Jesus. Those who are acquainted with the gospel history, will see the beauty and propriety of the apostle John's expression, 1st chapter of his gospel, and 14th verse, "And the Word was made flesh, and "dwelt among us." It is not improper to adduce here, the evangelists' authorities because they were his disciples and may be supposed interested parties. For they are the only witnesses from whom we can expect a testimony upon this subject; and considering them as employed in giving a full account of his character and life, however they might be supposed to disguise or add, they could not wholly conceal a character fundamentally wrong: and as there are more of them than one, it would have been impossible for them to have avoided inconsistencies and clashing, if they had not kept to the truth in point of fact, at least, if not of character; and indeed their whole histories are facts without any laboured encomiums, which carry the most internal marks of sincerity of any histories extant among men.

There seems not only no design to embellish their master's character, but none to conceal the defects of their own. It is from the partizans of Mahomet only, and what they have recited of his history, including his own writings, that we learn his avarice, pride, and lust. Add to this, that indifferent writers among the heathens have spoken to the praise of Jesus. I am sensible however, and think it best to inform you, that several of the writings taken notice of by some of the ancient fathers, are probably spurious, as the letters from Agbarus King of Edessa to Christ, and the letter in answer to it from Christ to him. Eusebius tells the story of Agbarus having heard of Christ's fame, and sending to him to come and cure him.

Euſebius in this caſe ſeems really to have given credit to it, on the memorials preſented to him by the church of Edeſſa—But the language given to Agbarus is too like that of a Chriſtian, and the anſwer of Jeſus Chriſt is miſquoting, as well as miſinterpreting ſcripture. See Dupin's Eccleſiaſtical Hiſtory. The letters ſaid to be from the Virgin Mary, are evident forgeries of a late date. The letter ſaid to be from Pilate to Tiberius, is not ſo univerſally acknowledged to be falſe. Biſhop Pearſon has largely and learnedly defended it, and it is very poſſible there might be ſome account ſent from Pilate to Rome at the time of Chriſt's crucifixion, even though the letter now to be ſeen ſhould not be genuine. There is alſo a paſſage of Joſephus, and in all the manuſcripts of that author, very favorable to the character of Chriſt. However without going further into theſe, the very ſilence of Joſephus, who is known to have been an enemy to the Chriſtian faith, is an evidence that he had nothing to object againſt the character of Chriſt, as he certainly would have done it willingly, and in the hiſtory of the Jews had ſo fair an opportunity.—The character then of Chriſt was not only blameleſs, but amiable. This is certainly a conſiderable preſumption in his favor. His credentials deſerve to be conſidered with care, and his pretenſions to be weighed with impartiality; nor ought it to be forgotten here, that his own ſincerity was proven in the moſt unqueſtionable manner. He ſealed his teſtimony with his blood. That he was tried, condemned, and crucified for his pretenſions, is abſolutely certain. This is one of the moſt important facts in the hiſtory of the goſpel, and it does not admit of any doubt, for his enemies reproach him with it, and his friends affirm and glory in it. We may depend upon it therefore that he was ſincere. He would never forfeit all that could be dear on earth, and ſuffer an ignominious death, for what he knew to be falſe.

II. Let us next conſider his ſituation and hopes. In any great and hazardous undertaking, eſpecially in an impoſtor, there muſt be ſome poſſible or probable way of accounting for the motives of the deceiver. In this caſe there is nothing that can lead us to ſuppoſe, or that can

well admit the ſuppoſition, of his contriving a cunningly deviſed fable. He was of that rank in life which could not readily inſpire that reſolution; he was of that ſort of education that could not fit him for carrying it into practice, or give the leaſt probable hopes of ſucceſs, if he ſhould attempt it. When his enemies, as they all did at firſt, called him the carpenter and the carpenter's ſon, they did not obſerve the force of that, when impartially conſidered. One of no higher capacity and inſtruction, could neither be ſuppoſed fit to conceive or execute ſo noble a deſign. Could he, ſuppoſing him a mere man, in that ſphere of life, have the leaſt expectation of prevailing over the power and wiſdom of the world combined againſt him? Whoever weighs this with impartiality, will find it very ſatisfying and convincing to the mind.

III. It receives, however, great additional force from the next particular, viz. the ſpirit of his religion, and that ſcheme of doctrine and ſyſtem of duty, which he promulgated and ſupported. It was directly oppoſed (in the firſt place) to the prejudices of the Jews. Could we even ſuppoſe, which is otherwiſe ſo difficult, that all the preparatory diſpenſations, and the whole concordant ſucceſſion of Jewiſh Prophets, and the general perſuaſion of the Jews and the Eaſtern part of the world, (teſtified by the Heathen Hiſtorians) that a great prince was to come from that country and lay the foundation of a laſting dominion, happened by chance.—Could we next ſuppoſe, that a cunning impoſtor, finding things in this ſituation, was willing to take the advantage of it, and paſs himſelf upon the world for the expected prince, he would no doubt have formed his plan upon the views which the Jews had; and muſt have founded his hope of ſucceſs entirely upon this circumſtance. They expected a temporal prince, and he came an humble teacher, and ſuffering Saviour. By this means he had not only the diſpoſition of the corrupt, but the prejudices of the beſt part of his countrymen, to oppoſe. What a ſtrange ſcheme of human contrivance! he had no reaſon to think he could convince men, and he taught that it was unlawful to force them! This reaſoning is ſupported by experience. In fact, during the

period from Chriſt's death to the deſtruction of Jeruſalem, there were many impoſtors who made their appearance, and they every one took the meaſures I have deſcribed above. The Jews expected a mighty Conqueror, and they always appeared at the head of a band of fighting men. Every impoſtor would act the ſame part in a ſimilar caſe.—Again, as his plan was oppoſed to the prejudices of the Jews, ſo indeed it was oppoſed to the prejudices of human nature. The croſs of Chriſt was fooliſhneſs to the Greeks, as well as a ſtumbling-block to the Jews. The humility and ſelf-denial of the goſpel and the precepts of paſſive ſubmiſſion, as well as the diſtinct account our Saviour gives to his diſciples of the oppoſition and ſuffering they muſt expect, had nothing in them alluring to the world in general, and did not ſeem at all calculated to draw away diſciples after him. When I ſay this, I am very ſenſible that moral precepts, in ſome degree, muſt ſanctify even an impoſture itſelf. If any man were to pretend a divine miſſion, and teach groſs immorality, he would be deſpiſed and diſbelieved, even by immoral men. But a contrived religion, that the contriver wiſhes to proceed, muſt be accommodated to human taſte.—Whereas, like the religion of Chriſt, true religion has been, is, and always will be, contrary to the ſpirit of the world.—I ſhall juſt add that the founder of the Chriſtian faith did not contrive his religion, ſuppoſing it ever ſo ſucceſsful, in ſuch a way as to bring honor or profit to himſelf, or thoſe who ſhould be afterwards concerned in the adminiſtration of it. Inſtead of preaching up form and ceremony, ſtately temples, and coſtly ſacrifices, he preached them down, and ſhewed that they were vain, when conſidered in themſelves, and only valuable as types and ſhadows; ſo that they were to ceaſe after his appearance. Inſtead of exalting his prieſts and miniſters, he makes them ſervants of all: This reflection upon pure religion and undefiled, as delivered by our Saviour himſelf, will appear to have great force, if you conſider, that it is from this very quarter that all the corruptions of Chriſtianity in the following ages took their riſe; they proceeded from

that love of pomp and power, and the influence of that worldly ſpirit which he took ſo much pains to reſtrain.

IV. Let us conſider what meaſures he fell upon to procure a favourable reception to his doctrine. He called and employed twelve poor illiterate fiſhermen, no way qualified for ſuch an undertaking.

On this part of the ſubject it has been often ſhewn with great force of reaſon, that if the goſpel were a fable, the apoſtles who bore ſo great a part in its firſt publication, muſt have been impoſtors or enthuſiaſts, deceivers, or deceived; both theſe points have been labored by ſeveral eminent writers, and it has been ſhewn that they could not be either the one or the other. Not deceivers, becauſe they had not the leaſt temptation to it. There was not only nothing to gain by it, but they were obliged to ſuffer the loſs of all things for their adherence to the Saviour. Poverty they muſt and did ſuffer, during his life-time; and though, during a great part of his perſonal miniſtry, they had the favour of the people, yet about the time, and ever after his crucifixion, when the apoſtles came to appear upon the ſcene, continual reproach and univerſal ſcorn was their portion; the truth is, they ſeem to have been forced into the ſervice, for a mixture of fear and unbelief made them all forſake him and fly, when he came to his laſt conflict. Neither could they be enthuſiaſts, and themſelves under the power of deluſion, for many reaſons. Their maſter was well known to them, living with them in a ſtate of the moſt intimate familiarity. It was not to a ſingle fact that they bore teſtimony, but to a whole character and life. His miracles alſo were all plain and public, and of ſuch a nature as that the deceit muſt have been eaſily perceived. But there is another circumſtance more powerful than any other, he profeſſed to endow theſe his diſciples with a power of working miracles themſelves. Now certainly in this they could not be deceived. A man may, by great ſlight and addreſs, make me believe he does a thing that he cannot do; but to make me believe that I myſelf, through my whole life, and at a diſtance from him, and even after his death, can, and do perform many things, which yet I do not,

is plainly more than improbable; it is literally impoſſible. So juſt are theſe remarks, that in fact, even the diſciples of Chriſt themſelves, appear ſo far from having laid any ſcheme of deluſion, that they appear plainly, at firſt, to have been under the ſame prejudices with the reſt of the Jews. They ſeem evidently to have expected him to appear as a temporal prince and conqueror; and probably their hopes of honor and offices in the kingdom which he was to eſtabliſh, contributed at firſt, in part, to their yielding to the evidence of his divine power. This ſeems to have been the import of the requeſt of the mother of James and John, "Lord grant that theſe my two "ſons may ſit," &c. as alſo it ſeems to have been the meaning of this queſtion, put to him by his diſciples in general, Acts. 1. 6. Lord wilt thou at this time reſtore "the kingdom to Iſrael?" If this was the caſe, can any perſon believe they were deceived? would not the diſappointment of their carnal expectations have provoked them to forſake him, if they had not been brought under the power of inward conviction, from what they ſaw and heard?

It is proper to remark here upon the meaſures he took to procure reception to his doctrine, that he framed his religion totally different in kind, and in principle, from all the heathen religions.

They differed from one another in the objects of their worſhip, and in their ſeveral rites, but they were all ſuppoſed to be conſiſtent. There were, in different countries and even cities, different gods and different ways of worſhip; perhaps alſo different families had various houſehold goods in one city; but they were not ſuppoſed to be deſtructive of each others divinity; ſo that it was eaſy to introduce the worſhip of a deity into any place in which it had not been before. It was remarked of Athens by an ancient writer, becauſe of its readineſs to adopt the worſhip of every divinity, that it was hoſpitable to the gods. But Chriſt on the contrary, in his religion equally oppoſed them all, declaring that the gods made with hands which the Gentiles worſhipped, were no gods. This was highly conſonant to reaſon, becauſe no lie is of the truth; yet

it would have been highly impolitic in an impoſtor, and indeed would not readily have occurred to an impoſtor. It is remarkable that Lord Shaftſbury has attacked the Chriſtian religion on this very head: he commends the heathen religion as of a ſociable nature, whereas the Chriſtian is abhorrent from all others. This ſhews how much the greateſt men may be made ſilly by prejudices; for nothing can be plainer, than that whatever is according to truth, muſt be oppoſite to every falſehood.—When we put all theſe things together, with the enlargements of which they are capable, and which will probably occur to moſt of you in hearing, they ſeem to take away all poſſibility of ſuppoſing the goſpel to be the product of an impoſtor.

III. The third general head of preſumptive evidence, contains the circumſtances attending the publication of the goſpel. Many of theſe are worthy of obſervation, and we ſhall find that, taking them ſingly or collectively, they are in general ſuch as, ſuppoſing the goſpel to be true, greatly illuſtrate the wiſdom of God in the choice of them; but on the other ſuppoſition, they were the moſt unfavorable for procuring a reception, and cauſing ſucceſs to an impoſtor.—The time of Chriſt's appearance is called in ſcripture the fulneſs of time. This indeed may be underſtood as only meaning the appointed time—that which had been fixed by the ancient prophecies. There are however many other reſpects, in which it may be called the fulneſs of time. The ignorance and wickedneſs of the world had come to a full height. The remains of tradition for many ages continued to have ſome effect, but were by this time wholly obliterated by the inventions of men.

There had alſo been full time to try every other method of reformation; ſo that the intervention of divine providence, according to the teſtimony of ſeveral heathen writers, was become neceſſary. Whoever will look into the reaſoning of Cicero, "De natura Deorum," and his other moral, or theological diſputations, will have a very clear and full conviction, how much men of the fineſt genius and greateſt penetration, were bewildered upon the ſubject

of religion. This very thing indeed has been recommended by ſome judicious perſons for a man to ſatisfy himſelf of the neceſſity of revelation in general, and if this is fully done, the acceptance of the Chriſtian religion follows as a ſpeedy conſequence.

We may alſo take notice, that the world in general at the time of Chriſt's appearance, was fitted in a manner it never had been before, for ſpreading the knowledge of the truth with the greateſt facility and ſpeed. The Roman Empire, which had riſen gradually, was then extended in a manner over the whole known world. Before that time, the immenſe number of ſmall, independent, and commonly hoſtile ſtates, rendered mutual acceſs and intercourſe far more difficult. It is true, before this, the Aſſyrian and Perſian monarchies were of conſiderable extent, but neither comparable to this, nor of any long duration. But now the nations being united under one head, it was eaſy to carry the tidings of ſalvation to the moſt diſtant corners. Add to this the favorable circumſtance, that there was peace over all the world at the time of Chriſt's birth; a fit emblem of his character who was the Prince of Peace. It was alſo deſigned for another purpoſe, that there might be eaſy acceſs and opportunity to the Apoſtles, to fulfil their commiſſions, Mark xvi. 15. "Go ye into all the world," &c. The event fully correſponded to this preparation for it in providence; for it is incredible to think with what rapidity the apoſtles carried the name of Chriſt through the world, and how early the goſpel was preached to the moſt diſtant nations. It is alſo obſervable that when this purpoſe had been ſerved by it, the power and greatneſs of the Romans came to an end. As ſoon as the church was planted in different corners of the Roman Empire, that vaſt body, which had long been growing to ſuch an enormous bulk, was firſt rent into two parts, and then broken into innumerable ſmaller diviſions. Take it therefore as a great deſign of Providence—the time and circumſtances appear admirably to illuſtrate it. But on the other hand, what probability could there be, that a handful of illiterate mechanics ſhould be able to overthrow the whole ſyſtem of Heathen

theology, that had continued ſo long and ſpread ſo wide; —that they ſhould think of doing this, in oppoſition to the power of princes, the learning of philoſophers, the intereſted policy of prieſts, and the rage, and enthuſiaſm of a deluded people! Strange indeed, that theſe ſucceſsful agents, ſhould come even from an obſcure corner, and from a nation that was of all others, not merely deſpiſed, but execrated and abhorred. That they ſhould, notwithſtanding, ſucceed by preaching the divinity of a crucified man, a fact that carried in it the higheſt idea of baſeneſs and ignominy. Finally, that they ſhould do this without the parade or form of worſhip to engage attention; without ſecrets or myſteries to excite veneration: but by the ſimplicity of that truth, which the worldly man deſpiſes, and the ſtrictneſs of that law which the ſinner hates.

LECTURE VI.

WE now come to the principal and direct evidences for the truth of the chriſtian religion. This is of ſuch a nature, as to be in itſelf full and concluſive; ſo that if the facts alluded to be true, the conſequence is neceſſary and unavoidable. Preſumptive evidence is ſometimes of ſuch a nature, and carried ſo far by the concurrence of circumſtances, as to produce even a clear and full conviction; yet it differs in its kind from the direct concluſive proof.—A few circumſtances of probability do but little, they gradually riſe in ſtrength by an addition to their number, but a direct proof, though ſingle, if juſt, ſatisfies the mind. In this view, the proof of the truth of the Chriſtian religion is the working of miracles. A ſupernatural power is the ſeal, or ſanction of a ſupernatural commiſſion. Perhaps, however, as the Chriſtian religion is the completion of one great ſyſtem, which began to

take place from the very fall of man, was gradually opened in ſucceeding ages, and perfected by the incarnation of the Son of God, we may divide even this ſingle proof into two parts, the one conſiſting of the fulfilling the prophecies of the Old Teſtament, and the other of the miracles performed by our Lord in the days of his fleſh.—Theſe ultimately reſt upon the ſame principle, for the foreſeeing, and the foretelling of events future and diſtant, is as real a miracle, and perhaps as fully ſatisfying to the mind, as any other whatever. But before entering upon theſe two ſeparate branches, it will be beſt to begin with what is common to both, and conſider, 1. What is a miracle. 2. What is its proper import in confirmation of a doctrine, and the force of the proof.

I. Then let us conſider the queſtion, what is a miracle? Some ſay it is a reverſing, altering, or ſuſpending the courſe of nature, or its ordinary or general laws. Some ſay it is doing what is above the power of a creature or a finite being—And ſome, that it is doing what is demonſtrably above the power of the immediate agent.—As to the firſt of theſe I would obſerve, that reverſing, altering, or ſuſpending the courſe of nature, is certainly a miracle; but the definition is not ſufficiently comprehenſive, becauſe every miracle is not of that kind. The predicting the recovery of a perſon in ſickneſs with ſpecial circumſtances, as in the caſe of Hezekiah, or diſcovering a knowledge of things diſtant, as in the caſe of what our Saviour ſaid to Nathaniel, are as clearly and evidently miracles, as any dominion over nature; beſides it is not always in our power to ſay whether there is any controul or alteration of the laws of nature or not, as when our Saviour ſpoke to the winds and the ſea, and immediately there was a great calm; a ſudden calm might have happened in the courſe of things, and yet its following at that inſtant carried ſuch a conviction with it, that the beholders immediately and juſtly ſaid, "Behold what manner of man is "this," &c.

Againſt miracles, under this view of controuling the courſe of nature, Lord Shaftſbury, with his uſual vivacity, and at the ſame time with his uſual prejudice and partial-

ity, has objected thus; "ſtrange," ſays he, "to make the "altering the courſe of nature a mark of the Divinity, "when this is not ſo convincing and ſatisfying a proof of "the being and perfections of God, as the order and re-"gularity of the courſe of nature." But nothing can be more equivocal, and indeed diſingenuous, than this manner of ſpeaking; for as the firſt conſtitution, and conſtant preſervation of the frame of nature, is a proof of the wiſdom and power of its Maker, ſo an expreſs viſible interpoſition in his own work, at his own time, and for his own great purpoſes, is certainly a moſt convincing proof of his power and preſence. I ſhew my power in my family, by altering, as well as giving my commands; and my property in my ground, by cutting down a tree, when I have uſe for it in other ſervice, as well as by planting it, or pruning it.

The ſecond definition of a miracle is, that it is doing what is above the power of any finite being, and therefore ſhews itſelf to be the finger of God. This, though very often adopted by writers, I think is liable to great exceptions. We certainly can hardly be thought capable of defining what is above the power of the finite creature, and what not. Creation is juſtly reckoned an incommunicable power, though this is only a conſequence from revelation, and particularly from worſhip being founded upon creation, and from this circumſtance joined with it, that God will not give his glory to another; but what powers God may communicate to creatures, other than this, we cannot ſay, ſuch as knowing the thoughts—perceiving things at a diſtance—making a man to do ſo by private intimation or expreſſion—controuling the elements, and many others that might be mentioned;—therefore I apprehend it is the third that we muſt reſt upon as the true and genuine definition of a miracle, &c. when it is evidently above the natural power of the viſible agent, the perſon at whoſe command, at whoſe deſire, or in atteſtation of whoſe claim, it is wrought. This is the point upon which we can moſt eaſily ſatisfy ourſelves; and it is as ſure an evidence of divine authority, as if we could certainly tell whether the thing produced, could, or could not,

be effected by a finite power. It was from this that the Jews concluded that our Saviour had the preſence and aſſiſtance of God; "For no man can do the miracles that "thou doſt, except God be with him."

We are now to conſider what is the import of a miracle, and of its effect in confirmation of a doctrine. Prodigies, and wonderful things, properly prove nothing at all, except when they are profeſſedly wrought in atteſtation of ſome truth, or of ſome claim of the perſon who does them. They reſt upon this ſuppoſition, that ſuch a power is an evidence of a divine commiſſion, and they are naturally expected as the credentials of thoſe who pretend a divine commiſſion. The Jews, you ſee, made the demand of our Saviour, John, vi. 30. "What ſign ſheweſt thou," &c. and though he ſometimes refuſed to gratify their malicious petulance or obſtinate incredulity, yet in general he appealed to his works, as the juſt and proper teſtimonies of his divine commiſſion, John x. 25. "The "works that I do," &c. John xv. 24. "If I had not "done among them," &c. There are ſome who tell us that a miracle in atteſtation of the truth of a doctrine, muſt be conſidered as a ſanction to it, only if this doctrine is in itſelf credible, conſonant to reaſon, and worthy of belief. Thoſe who reaſon in this manner, ſay, that ſome doctrines are ſo contrary or ſo ſhocking to reaſon, that no evidence can be more plain, even when a miracle is wrought, than the evidence of ſuch doctrines being contrary to the nature and perfections of God. But I look upon this manner of reaſoning to be very unjuſt and inconcluſive. It tends in the reſult to ſet the reaſonings of men, independent of revelation, above the teſtimony of God, and revelation itſelf.—This ſeems to be the darling theme, not only of infidels, but of pretended friends to revealed religion, who are worſe if poſſible than infidels themſelves. It is eaſy to ſee that if this is the caſe, there can be no benefit received by revelation.—Miracles are the only ſanction that can be given to a revelation—Yet before theſe will be admitted, or ſuffered to be heard, theſe reaſoners tell us, that we muſt conſider the doctrine itſelf, whether it is worthy of God; and if they ſhall be pleaſed to judge that it is not, the miracles, and any other evidence that can

be given, are ſet at nought as of no value, and the matter not even brought to a trial.—This I apprehend to be really the caſe with many in the preſent age: but it ſeems to me very plain, that ſuch is our blindneſs and ignorance in the things of God, that we know very little about them, till they are made known by God himſelf; and if we were to make our own reaion the previous ſtandard of what was admiſſible or not in quality of revelation, it would make mad work indeed. I ſhall care very little what men of vain and carnal minds ſay of my ſentiments; but I have been many years of opinion, that as revelation was neceſſary, and revelation is given us, we act the moſt wiſe and truly rational part, if we take all our theological opinions immediately, and without challenge, from the oracles of truth. I confeſs it is agreeable to me to ſhew, that the truths of the everlaſting goſpel are agreeable to ſound reaſon, and founded upon the ſtate of human nature; and I have made it my buſineſs through my whole life to illuſtrate this remark. Yet to begin by making the ſuggeſtion of our own reaſon the ſtandard of what is to be heard or examined as a matter of revelation, I look upon to be highly dangerous, manifeſtly unjuſt, and inconſiſtent with the foundation-ſtone of all revealed religion, viz. that reaſon, without it, is inſufficient to bring us to the knowledge of God and our duty; and therefore as Socrates ſaid to Alcibiades, "It is reaſonable to think that God will come "down into the world, to teach us his will." I am not inſenſible how far it would be juſt to carry the principle on which our adverſaries ground their ſentiments. Any new principles or doctrines, ſeemingly abſurd in themſelves, and unholy in their effects, would not, with judicious perſons, be raſhly or ſuddenly admitted; and the more ſuſpicious the principles are in themſelves, no doubt we muſt examine the pretenſions to miracles the more carefully.—This is the part of prudence; but to carry it further, and ſay, we will receive no evidence that God has taught any thing different from what we ourſelves think reaſonable, is juſt weakening the truth before admitted, that revelation immediately from himſelf is evidently neceſſary.

It will be ſaid by ſome, that ſometimes pretenſions not only to revelation, but to miracles, are contradictory and deſtructive of each other. I admit there may be ſuch a ſuppoſition made, but I look upon it as a neceſſary conſequence of the wiſdom of the divine government, that he will not ſuffer any of theſe things to be, without ſufficient marks whereby an impartial enquirer may diſcover the difference. This was the caſe of Moſes and the magicians in Egypt, they were ſuffered to perform many things ſimilar to his miracles, but ſtill the great ſuperiority was to be ſeen in his; and perhaps by the compariſons made between them and the other, there was the more evident demonſtration of the finger of God. On this whole ſubject, and particularly the import of miracles as the proof of a doctrine, ſee Biſhop Fleetwood's works.—Theſe two preliminary points being diſcuſſed, what remains may be ſtated with the greater brevity, and to the greater advantage. The miracles in behalf of the truth of the goſpel may be divided, as hinted above, into two parts, the fulfilling the prophecies of the Old Teſtament, and the miracles during Chriſt's perſonal miniſtry.—As to the firſt of theſe, nothing is more plain than the faith of believers being pointed from the earlieſt ages to a Saviour to come. From the firſt promiſe that the ſeed of the woman ſhould bruiſe the ſerpent's head, through all the after diſcoveries of the divine will, this was manifeſt, and indeed more and more manifeſt, as it drew nearer to the fulneſs of time. Their foreknowledge and foretelling of future events is one of the moſt ſatisfying kind of miracles, and leaſt liable to deceit. Chriſt was therefore the promiſed ſeed—The deſire of all nations—The hope of Iſrael—The prophet that ſhould come into the world. That he appeared at the time fixed in the ancient prophecies—that he anſwered all the characters or deſcriptions of the ancient prophets, that he did this in a way ſo peculiar that he plainly fulfilled them, although not in the way the miſtakes of the latter Jews made them expect from him, is clearly apparent; and as I have ſtated, under the head of preſumptive proof, their having departed from the genuine ſpirit of the promiſes, and his appearing in a

way contrary to their expectations, only seems to destroy every suspicion of fraud and imposture. Imposture could not have been continued and handed down through so many ages. Nothing like this is to be seen, or has ever been heard of, in the history of mankind, and therefore Christ, as the Messias of the Jews, must give the most favourable reception to Christ as the Saviour of the world.* Here too we might particularly consider the miracles Christ performed in the days of his flesh. Them he appealed to as the evidences of his divine mission. But after the remarks that have been made above, on the subject absolutely considered, it will not be necessary to extend this part of it, I only remark that his miracles were upon the plainest subjects—the winds—healing the sick—feeding the multitude—raising the dead. The Pharisees foolishly asked a sign from heaven. It had been much easier to have dazzled their eyes with the appearance of some extraordinary meteor in the airy regions, than to have given them the proofs which he actually did.—I do not stay to illustrate the tender and benevolent subject of many of his miracles.

LECTURE VII.

WE now proceed to the consequential proofs of the truth of the Christian religion, that is to say, the circumstances that have arisen since the coming of Christ in the flesh, and his crucifixion on Mount Calvary. These I shall divide into the following branches. 1. Its incredible progress by the most unlikely means—great ex-

* See Redder's demonstration of the Messias.

tent—and long continuance. 2. The great and valuable effects produced by it. 3. The visible fulfilment of scripture prophecies.

I. Let us consider its incredible progress. Immediately after Christ's ascension his disciples went into different parts of the world, and spread the truth with a success altogether astonishing. It is agreed, I believe, that in less than fifty years the gospel was preached and embraced throughout the vast extent of the Roman Empire.—This argument does not appear in its full force, unless we consider by what means the effect was produced. The apparent instruments were only a few fishermen of Galilee, without either power or learning. One would think it quite incredible that any of them should ever think of forming the design, still more so, that they should agree in it; for they were many and without a head; and that, though agreed, they should carry it into execution. That Minos in Crete, and Numa, at Rome, professed lawgivers and heads of their petty inconsiderable tribes, should pretend intercourse with the gods, and procure reverence for their decrees, or that they should succeed in their little dominions for a very short time, is not wonderful. But that such persons as Matthew the Publican and his companions, should form a design of subverting the whole of the old religion, and introducing the new, and succeed in it, is altogether astonishing. The wonder increases when we consider that these men were not united under any system of government among themselves, further than their principles of obedience to their Master, who had left the world. There was not any of them who claimed, or possessed superiority over the rest. They were separated from one another without any prospect of ever meeting again on earth.—Yet that they should agree in their doctrine, and propagate one religion, and that their separate writings should be the harmonious and concordant sum and standard of that religion, is not to be accounted for without the power and influence of that Providence which is over all the earth. It is not to be omitted here, that they obtained this success by preaching the divinity of a man who had been crucified, the most odious and contemptible idea

that could be preſented to the human mind. One would have thought that as ſoon as Chriſt was crucified, it would at once have put an end to all further reſpect and attention to him. This it is moſt likely his enemies, the high-prieſts and Phariſees, thought themſelves quite certain of, which made them ſo intent upon his crucifixion. I cannot help obſerving, that ſome judicious commentators have imagined that the Devil, the great enemy of mankind, ſuppoſed the ſame thing. He, though acquainted in general with the end of the Saviour's miſſion, yet certainly was not acquainted with every part of the deſign of infinite wiſdom, and thought, if he prevailed to have Chriſt rejected by the Jews, judged, condemned and crucified by the Romans, he ſhould entirely defeat the deſign. They ſuppoſe this to be the meaning of his triumphing over principalities and powers, making a ſhew of them on his croſs, and by death deſtroying them that had the power of death, that is the Devil. I muſt further obſerve, that the whole doctrine of Chriſt is moſt directly oppoſed to human pride; ſo much ſo indeed, that after it is embraced, and there is a general profeſſion of it in any place, a worldly ſpirit is never at eaſe endeavoring to corrupt and alter it. I ſhall add but one circumſtance more. The goſpel was then ſucceſsful, notwithſtanding the greateſt and moſt violent oppoſition made to it from every quarter. The heathen religions, as obſerved formerly, were not ſuppoſed to be mutually repugnant, and did not contend with one another; but they all contended with the goſpel, which was indeed their common enemy. The moſt violent perſecutions were raiſed againſt the Chriſtians throughout all the Roman empire. The philoſophers and learned men, who had never contended with the popular religion, all united their force againſt the Chriſtian religion. Yet the divine wiſdom defeated the counſel of the wiſe, and brought to nought the underſtanding of the prudent; that no fleſh might glory in his preſence. I muſt more particularly obſerve that Julian the apoſtate, who was not only the moſt inveterate, but alſo the moſt wiſe and able enemy that ever ſet himſelf in oppoſition to the Chriſtian faith, tried to aſſault it in every way that could be thought of,

he found that cruelty and violence would not do; then he tried reproach and public ſhame. He encouraged the philoſophers by his kindneſs, and aſſiſted them by his writings, and indeed he carried on his oppoſition with ſo much zeal that he even attempted the reformation of the pagan religion, by inſiſting on the heathen prieſts imitating the Chriſtians in their mortified carriage, and the charitable care of the poor. But all would not do, and he himſelf by the circumſtances of his death, proved one of the greateſt means of ſpreading the triumphs of the goſpel. When all theſe circumſtances, with the enlargements of which they are capable, are taken together, the ſucceſs of the goſpel is a very powerful evidence of its divine original, ſo that we may well ſay, as the apoſtle did, "ſo mightily grew the word of God and prevailed."

II. The ſecond thing to be conſidered is the great and valuable effects produced by the goſpel. There is the greater reaſon to inſiſt upon this part of the ſubject that enemies have ſhewed a great inclination to deny or miſrepreſent them. I am however perſuaded that on a fair and candid examination, the effects of the goſpel will appear to be truly great, and truly extenſive. The effects of the goſpel may be conſidered in two views, as producing knowledge and practice. Now did not the goſpel introduce ſome knowledge in religion? whoever will compare the ſyſtem of religious belief which prevailed before, with that which took place after the publication of the goſpel, will ſee the great excellence and virtue of that diſpenſation. Such was the power of divine light that it actually in a ſhort time baniſhed the abſurd polytheiſm and idolatry of the heathen nations. So compleat was the victory that it never has again dared to lift up its head. The enemies of religion are not now to be ſtripped of Venus and Bacchus and the whole catalogue of thoſe fictious deities, the worſhip of whom, while it claimed to be religion, was nothing but a diſcipline of ignorance, vice and impurity. The only knowledge of religion which was of value among the ancients was the remains of tradition from the patriarchial age, and whatever now deſerves that

name is borrowed from the goſpel. It was an early remark of the Chriſtian apologiſts, that the goſpel had put to ſilence the heathen oracles.

On this head it is particularly remarkable, that the knowledge of religion which is the fruit of the goſpel, is the acquiſition of the multitude. There was ſomething of this mentioned formerly in another view. It deſerves however repeated notice, that the goſpel was preached to the poor and brought light, not to particular men, but to mankind in general. A mechanic or peaſant, inſtructed in the oracles of truth, has now more juſt and conſiſtent notions of God, his perfections, his laws, his Providence, than the moſt renowned philoſophers of ancient times.

It is obſerved by ſome when on this ſubject, that the goſpel has introduced the greateſt improvements of human as well as divine knowledge; not but that thoſe arts which depend entirely upon the exertion of human talents and powers, were carried to as great perfection before, as ſince the coming of Chriſt, in the heathen as in the Chriſtian world, ſuch as poetry, painting, ſtatuary, &c. But natural knowledge, or the knowledge of the conſtitution and courſe of nature, began with, and increaſed by religious light; all the theories of the ancients, as to the formation and preſervation of the earth and heavens were childiſh and trifling. From revelation we learn the ſimple account of the creation of all things out of nothing, by the omnipotence of God; and perhaps there are few things more delightful, than to obſerve that the lateſt diſcoveries in philoſophy, have never ſhewn us any thing but what is perfectly conſiſtent with the ſcripture doctrine and hiſtory. There is one modern claſs or ſect of divines, who affirm that all human ſcience is to be found in the Bible—natural philoſophy, aſtronomy, chronology.—This I am afraid is going too far; but I think it had not been poſſible for any writer or writers in the age of the ſacred penmen, to have wrote ſo much on the creation of the world, and its hiſtory ſince that, without being guilty of abſurdities and contradictions; unleſs they had been under the direction of an infallible guide.

The next branch of this head is, to conſider the effects of the goſpel, as to practice. Here I think, the firſt thing is to conſider the manifeſt tendency and profeſſed aim of the goſpel itſelf, and its effects on thoſe who truly believe it, and live according to it. The temper and character of ſuch will appear to be truly admirable, and the more ſo upon a very ſtrict and critical examination, if we conſider the nobleneſs of their principles, the ſtrictneſs, regularity, and univerſality of their practice, the uſefulneſs and happy effects of their converſation.—A Chriſtian's heart is poſſeſſed by the love of God, and his will ſubjected to the order of his providence. Moderation and ſelf-denial is his rule with reſpect to himſelf, and unfeigned good-will, proved by active beneficence, with regard to others. Nor is this at all matter of mere theory—it is certainly matter of experience; nay, its influence hath been, as it ought to be, powerful in gaining the aſſent of others to the truth of the doctrine. The viſible and eminent piety of the firſt miniſters of the New Teſtament, and the earlieſt converts, had the greateſt effect in procuring reception to the principle that produced them. The general integrity of their lives, and the eminent appearance in ſome of them of the illuſtrious virtues, charity, fortitude and patience, was what ſubdued all oppoſition.

The heathens ſometimes reproached one another by the compariſon, ſaying, ſee how theſe Chriſtians love one another; how honorable was it, when one of the apologiſts (Lactantius) was able to ſay, give me a man who is wrathful, malicious, revengeful, and with a few words of God I will make him calm as a lamb: give me one that is a covetous, niggardly miſer, and I will give you him again, liberal, bountiful, and dealing out of his money by handsful: give me one that is fearful of pain and of death, and immediately, he ſhall deſpiſe racks, and croſſes, and the moſt dreadful puniſhments you can invent.

If we were to make a compariſon between particulars, I apprehend the advantage would appear very juſt; but it is uſual to ſtate the compariſon, not with regard to thoſe that are truly religious, but to take it from the general conduct of thoſe who profeſs the goſpel. I am not ſure that

any compariſon is juſt but between real believers and others. However, we may make it both ways, and ſee how it will turn out. Compare the piety, humility, charity, and active zeal of a real Chriſtian, with the moſt ſtriking characters of ancient times, and the great ſuperiority of the firſt will appear. Not only ſottiſh idolatry, but luſt, pride, oſtentation, will appear to tarniſh many of the laſt in a remarkable degree. But even with regard to mere profeſſion, there is reaſon to ſay, that the manners of men are greatly improved, even where they are not ſanctified.

He who will conſider with attention the manners of ancient nations, will ſee great reaſon to abate of that veneration which his reading their exploits, as recorded by writers of eminence, may ſometimes lead him into. There are perſons to be found of ſuch barbarity—in many inſtances prevailing through a nation—the cuſtom of expoſing their children—and in the caſe of ſome, there was ſuch ferocity and cruelty, either plundering their enemies, or ſelling them for ſlaves—in ſacking cities—as would make a perſon of any humanity, ſhudder in reading them. Rollin's character of the ancient Spartans, and Preſident Goguet's account of the manners in general of the ancient ages, may give ſome conception of this matter.

LECTURE VIII.

THE third branch of this head, is the fulfilling of ſcripture prophecies. This is an argument very ſatisfying to the mind, and which might be illuſtrated by a great variety of examples. The Old Teſtament prophecies I have had occaſion to conſider in a former part of the ſubject, and ſhall not now reſume, further than by making this obſervation, that there are ſome prophecies here, which not only had their completion in Chriſt, but continue to be fulfilled in the preſent ſtate of the world

Some entertaining peculiarities of this kind may be seen in several writers upon the partition of the earth, and the manner of its being peopled. In Delany's Revelation examined with candor, there are some things well worthy of the attention of a judicious and critical reader. Take one example, he mentions the prophecy of Ishmael. "His hand shall be against every man, and every man's "hand against him, and he shall dwell in the presence of "all his brethren." He says that this prophecy is fulfilling at this time as well as formerly; that the posterity of Ishmael, who settled in Arabia, are the wild Arabs, a people that are in a state of opposition to all the neighboring nations; that they never were subdued by any of the different princes that obtained dominion in different ages in those countries, and continue unconnected and unsubdued to this day.

But one of the chiefest instances we have to take notice of, on the subject of scripture prophecies, is the history and present state of the Jewish Nation. The destruction of the city and temple of Jerusalem, was prophesied of by our Saviour, in a manner so distinct and so particular, that it is not easy to imagine any thing to exceed it. With regard to the temple in particular, he said that there should not remain one stone upon another that should not be thrown down. He describes the extreme misery of the people when Jerusalem should be compassed about with armies, and he fixes the time in the most precise manner, that that generation should not pass away till all was fulfilled; and finally, he warns his own disciples, when certain signs appeared, to fly for safety. The reality of those prophecies, from the time in which they happened and the facts with which they were connected, is so well established, as not to be easily capable of contradiction. And when we compare the event with them it is truly astonishing; as the guilt of that people was very great, so the judgments on them were the most signal, terrible, and lasting, that were ever inflicted on any nation.

Their own Historian (Josephus) gives such an account of the miseries of the siege, as is painful and shocking to read; at the same time the contentions within the walls,

and the unrelenting fury with which they were animated one againſt another, makes it impoſſible to conſider them in any other light, than as a blinded and deſerted people. Another circumſtance alſo well worthy of attention is, that as they had crucified the Saviour, and were particularly deſirous to have that puniſhment, which was not a Jewiſh but a Roman one, inflicted upon him; ſo in the courſe of that ſiege they were crucified round their own walls, in ſuch vaſt numbers that they wanted wood to make croſſes to hang them on; all this too was done under the command of Titus Veſpaſian, one of the mildeſt men that ever commanded an army—ſo that the ſupreme order of Providence ſeemed to be forcing into its own ſervice, every apparent inſtrument. It is well known that Titus, far from intending the deſtruction of the temple, had the utmoſt ſolicitude to have preſerved it, but all was to no purpoſe, for God had ſaid it ſhould be deſtroyed. To add no more upon this head, the Chriſtians in general, by attending to their maſter's predictions and following his advice, were preſerved from the calamity.

Beſide the deſtruction of the polite city and temple of Jeruſalem, the Jews themſelves, as a nation, continue a ſtanding proof of the Scripture prophecies. Their continuing a ſeparate people, notwithſtanding their diſperſion through all the earth for above 1700 years, and not mixing with other nations, is an event quite ſingular, that never happened in any other caſe; ſo that it appears quite ſupernatural, as if they were prepared by the providence of God to prove the truth of the Meſſiah, and to wait till their converſion ſhall crown the work, and be, as the ſcripture ſays, "life from the dead."

The other prophecies in the New Teſtament, in their accompliſhment in the courſe of Providence, do alſo afford much entertainment and inſtruction to a ſerious mind. They are principally contained in the Revelations of St. John the Divine. I ſhall only now take notice of one, viz. anti-chriſt, or the man of ſin, deſcribed in 2d Theſ. 2, 3. "Who oppoſeth and exalteth himſelf againſt all that is "called God," &c. The proteſtant writers, very gene-

rally ſuppoſe that the Pope and Roman Catholic ſyſtem of ſuperſtition are the anti-chriſt propheſied of, and indeed they ſeem very much to quadrate with the deſcription.—The ſetting in the temple of God, and ſhewing himſelf that he is God, correſponds ſurpriſingly with the extravagant pretenſions to infallibility in that church, and the exceſſive ſecular power and profit which it is intended to bring to the prieſt-hood. The account in the Revelation of kings and princes, giving their power and honor to the Beaſt, and no man being allowed to buy and ſell, but thoſe who had the mark of the Beaſt, correſponds exactly to the arrangements made by the Popiſh ſtates for many ages, to the uſurped dominion, and to that tyranny over conſcience, which was every where exerciſed. The deſcription of myſtical Babylon, in the 17th of the Revelations, ſeems in all reſpects to quadrate with the city of Rome. The ſeven heads are ſaid to be ſeven mountains on which the woman ſitteth, and in the cloſe of the chapter, it is ſaid "and the woman whom thou ſaweſt, is that great city, "that reigneth over the kings of the earth." To all this you may add that part of the deſcription, that ſhe was drunken with the blood of the Saints, which was ſo eminently fulfilled in the dreadful perſecutions for conſcience ſake, which were dictated by the anti-chriſtian ſpirit, and carried on in the anti-chriſtian ſtates. To finiſh this parallel, the two witneſſes who propheſied in ſack-cloth, are ſuppoſed to be thoſe, who never received the Romiſh ſuperſtitions, the Waldenſes and the Albigenſes in the Piedmonteſe vallies; by the hiſtory of whom it appears, that their faith and worſhip had been the ſame that it was from the beginning, and the ſame that was received and embraced at the reformation. This remarkable period is ſuppoſed to be painted in the deadly wound given to the beaſt, notwithſtanding which it did live, and in the ten horns, which ſhould hate the whore and make her deſolate, and eat her fleſh, and burn her with fire.

After this account, I muſt obſerve that there are ſome proteſtant writers, who have not fallen in with the ſcheme of making the Pope to be the anti-chriſt deſcribed in the New Teſtament; and as the apoſtle ſays, there are many anti-

chriſts, ſo theſe perſons ſay there is an anti-chriſtian ſpirit in every church, or the corrupt part conſtantly in oppoſition to the ſound—truth ſtriving with error, and pride with the meekneſs of the goſpel. If this is admitted, the Roman Catholic church may ſtill be conſidered as the ſcene of anti-chriſtian uſurpation, and it ſhould put all others upon their guard, leſt they in any degree partake of the ſin, and ſo expoſe themſelves to the judgment of the great whore. I ſhall only add, that there is a late opinion advanced by Mr. Glaſs and S——, which, ſo far as I know, was never thought of before theſe, viz. that an eſtabliſhed church is anti-chriſt, that whatever has the approbation and authority of the civil government in any ſtate interpoſed in its behalf, not only may, but muſt be contrary to the goſpel. This is certainly carrying matters to exceſs, as is uſual with intereſted perſons, incenſed with what they ſuppoſe to be injurious treatment. Mr. Glaſs being caſt out of the eſtabliſhed church of Scotland, and perhaps by an unneceſſary ſtretch of power, fell into this reſentful opinion; ſo that I do not ſee how this ſentiment can be ſupported, either from ſcripture or reaſon, as it would ſeem to make it impoſſible for the kingdoms of this world to become the kingdoms of our Lord and his Chriſt: or for kings to become nurſing fathers, and queens nurſing mothers to the church; but ſo far I ſhall readily admit, that an intolerant eſtabliſhment, and all tyranny over the conſcience, partakes of an anti-chriſtian ſpirit.

It will now be time to conſider a little, the objections againſt the Chriſtian religion. It is eaſy to ſee, that there muſt be in every infidel writer, particular cavils and exceptions, which are ſo numerous, and ſo various, that it would be in vain to attempt to mention them; but there are ſome general exceptions, which are to be found in all their writings, and on which they inſiſt moſt that it will be proper to take notice of. Two of theſe have indeed already been taken notice of, as they fell in the way, viz. That reaſon is a ſufficient guide to truth and happineſs and therefore revelation is unneceſſary; and that miracles are im-

poſſible, and incredible. Thoſe I paſs with what has been ſaid on them above.

A 3d. Objection which uſed to be very much inſiſted upon, is the want of univerſality. If the Chriſtian revelation was neceſſary, why was it not given in its full extent, from the beginning of the world, and ſpread through all nations? why was the world in general, ſo long left in darkneſs? and at this time, why are there ſuch vaſt regions, and ſuch multitudes of people, that are without the light of the goſpel? Many different anſwers have been given to this objection; ſome ſhewing the extent to which the goſpel has been carried; ſome ſhewing that the mercy of God through Chriſt will extend to all nations, in proportion to the improvement of the meaſure of light afforded them: But I apprehend there is a much more eaſy and ſatisfying anſwer to be given to it, which is this, that the objection proceeds from a groundleſs preſumption that we are to judge of all the divine proceedings, and find fault with them, becauſe they do not exactly follow the rules which we ſhould have preſcribed.—It militates equally againſt natural and revealed religion.—It may as well be aſked, why is not every reptile a man, and every man an angel? why is not every creature as happy as he poſſibly could have been made? Nature and Providence is full of inſtructive analogy upon this ſubject. Why was not the earth peopled as early and as fully as poſſible? Why were the vaſt tracts of fruitful land in America, ſuffered for ſo many ages to be a wild foreſt, inhabited by wolves and tigers, and a few men almoſt as fierce as they? Nay, we may go much further, and aſk, why was not the world, which appears to be only near 6000 years old, created millions of years before that period? The true and proper anſwer to every ſuch queſtion is, to reſolve it into the ſovereignty of God—he hath a right to beſtow his mercies, in the time, manner and meaſure, that ſeem good unto himſelf. With regard to the difficulty about creation, ſome have attempted to aſſume a neceſſity, that every thing is neceſſary to the good of the whole; and ſo a worm in its place is as neceſſary as an angel; and one writer has attempted to prove, that the world could not

have been created any ſooner; becauſe, though it were now a million of years old, inſtead of 6000, the queſtion would ſtill remain: but this is only wading beyond our depth, and uſing words to which if we affix any preciſe, it muſt be allowed, we have not a complete or adequate idea. With reſpect to the time of the publication, and the extent of the progreſs of goſpel light, or even the numbers that are benefitted by it, I would ſay, "even ſo Father, for ſo it ſeemed good in thy ſight;" and I would particularly obſerve, that ſtating this as an objection againſt the truth of the goſpel, is forgetting the great and fundamental doctrine of the goſpel, that all men are under ſin, and liable to the divine wrath; and that ſending Chriſt into the world, is an act of free and ſovereign grace. If therefore, it be really mercy to thoſe that are ſaved, no objection can be brought againſt it from the number of circumſtances of thoſe that periſh.

4th. Another great objection againſt Chriſtianity is, that it introduced into the world perſecution for conſcience ſake, which was before unknown. This is an argument on which infidels delight to enlarge. The fierce conteſts that have been upon the ſubject of religion, and the many who have died in the field, and been brought to a ſcaffold or ſtake, on religious accounts, have been ſet forth in all the force of language. There is no argument uſed by infidels that I think may be more eaſily refuted, or rather indeed, be effectually turned againſt themſelves than this. In the firſt place it is a plain accompliſhment of our Saviour's prediction, "think not I am come to ſend peace "on the earth." Now if this never happened before upon a religious account, which the argument ſuppoſes, by what means ſhould he foreſee it, but by a preternatural knowledge? But after we have gone thus far, we are ſtill to obſerve, that the Chriſtian religion in no other way introduced perſecution for conſcience ſake, than by ſuffering, not inflicting it. It was perſecuted by Jews and Gentiles with unrelenting fury, for 300 years after the coming of Chriſt in the fleſh. Is there any body that opens the Bible, that does not ſee that perſecution is not taught there? It will be ſaid that in after ages, Chriſ-

tians perſecuted Chriſtians, with as much rage as the Heathen ever did. I anſwer if that matter be carefully looked into, it will be found, that it was the ſpirit of the world that perſecuted the meek believers in Chriſt, in every age. There is a remark of a certain writer that the perſecution carried on againſt the Proteſtants in France, was not by bigots and thoſe under the power of ſuperſtition; but by thoſe who were low in their principles, and had no religion of any kind. But this is not ſo great a rarity as he imagined, for it is but ſeldom that perſons who are much in earneſt about religion themſelves, are concerned in oppoſing others; at any rate, it is manifeſt that none can raſhly judge, much leſs perſecute others, if they attend to the doctrine of the goſpel.

LECTURE IX.

Of the Doctrine of the Trinity.

IT ſeems highly neceſſary, that Students of Divinity, ſhould give particular attention to this ſubject, as it relates to the very nature of the true God who is the object of our worſhip and truſt. Indeed, as it is ſo nearly connected with the doctrine of redemption, its importance is apparent. We cannot form juſt notions, and indeed hardly any, of the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, without being explicit upon this head. Let us firſt endeavor to ſtate, briefly and clearly as poſſible, what the ſcriptures teach us to believe on the ſubject, as ſummed up in the Proteſtant confeſſion, diſtinguiſhing it from oppoſite errors, and afterwards give a ſuccinct view of the proofs. The doctrine may be

briefly ſummed in two branches (1) firſt the unity of the divine nature (2) the trinity of perſon in the divine eſſence.

Firſt, The unity of the divine nature.—That there is but one God, infinite, eternal, unchangeable, indiviſible. The unity of the God-head is greatly inſiſted on in ſcripture. It ſeems to have been the capital article of revealed truth under the Old Teſtament Diſpenſation, in oppoſition to the vanities of the gentiles. The firſt commandment of the decalogue is, "Thou ſhalt have no other "gods before me," and again Deut. vi. 4. "Hear O Iſrael "the Lord our God, is one Lord." The glory of God is particularly aſſerted upon this ſubject, that he will not give his glory to another nor his praiſe to graven images. The unity of God ſeems to be the grand article of natural religion, clearly ſupported by reaſon from the impoſſibility of ſuppoſing infinite perfection to reſide in more than one ſubject, as well as from the harmony and unity of the deſign that appears in the univerſal ſyſtem. This part of the ſubject ſuffers no difficulty which ariſes from the addition of the other particular from revelation, viz. (2) that in this unity of the divine nature, and in a perfect conſiſtency with it, there is a threefold diſtinction. In other words, there is the moſt perfect ſimplicity and unity of nature, and yet in the mode of exiſtence a plurality. We call it in Engliſh three perſons in the Godhead. The ancient fathers uſed to call it in greek *treis upostaseis*. It would be wrong to contend that either of theſe gives a full and adequate idea of it, becauſe indeed it is incomprehenſible. For in the language of inſpiration, it is ſaid to be the Father, the Word or the Son, and the Holy Ghoſt or Spirit. As ſoon as men began to diſpute upon the ſubject, and exerciſe their reaſon, imagination, or invention upon a matter of mere revelation (as was ſoon done, by the mixture of platonic philoſophy with the ſtudy of the ſcriptures) they fell into various oppoſite errors, which however were all of them conſtantly condemned and oppoſed by the conſent of orthodox writers. Some ſaid there was no diſtinction at all, in the divine being, only he was repreſented in different lights, and made known by different

names, as ſtanding in different relations to us. Sabellius, I believe was the firſt author of this doctrine, and they were afterwards called from him Sabellians, and ſometimes Patropaſſians, from the conſequence of that doctrine, that the Father as much as the Son, muſt have ſuffered upon the croſs. Others went to the oppoſite extreme, and ſuppoſed there are three wholly diſtinct and independent, but concordant beings: neither of theſe have ever been the general ſentiments of Chriſtian divines; nor do I think any of them is at all agreeable to ſcripture or reaſon. We find in ſcripture moſt clear and poſitive aſſertions of the unity of God on the one hand, and on the other, a real plurality, in ſome reſpects. There is a common, peculiar and reciprocal, but diſtinct agency. The Father is ſaid to beget the Son—to ſend the Son—and the Son to pray to the Father, to promiſe and to ſend the Spirit, which is ſaid to proceed from the Father—and the ſolemn benediction, is in the name and the grace of our Lord Jeſus Chriſt, and the communion of the Holy Ghoſt.

Some time before the council of Nice, Arius, ſet on foot his notions of the inferiority of the Son and Spirit, calling them, either properly or improperly, creatures. I uſe the word improperly, becauſe there were ſome, eſpecially in latter times, called refined Arians, who reſpected the Son as dependant in the order of nature; but at the ſame time, as an eternal effect, from an eternal cauſe.—In oppoſition to Arius, the council of Nice aſſerted the Son to be truly and properly God, of one ſubſtance with the Father, ſelf-exiſtent and independent. Laſt of all came the Pelagians, and the Socinians, who denied the divine nature of Chriſt altogether, and aſſerted that he was only a man. Theſe opinions, as doing the utmoſt violence to ſcripture, and over-throwing the whole doctrine of redemption, deſerved to be treated with the utmoſt abhorrence. Nor indeed are Arians at bottom much better, becauſe the difference between the moſt exalted creature and the meaneſt, vaniſhes altogether, when compared with the difference between the mightieſt order of created beings, and the true God.

The whole œconomy of our ſalvation teaches us the neceſſity of attending to and believing this doctrine; but I ſee neither neceſſity nor propriety in endeavoring to dip into the mode of it, and attempting to explain it. If it be a myſtery and above our comprehenſion, every attempt to explain it muſt be, if not criminal, yet unſucceſsful. And indeed this is the caſe with almoſt every thing that relates to God, or is connected with the Divine perfection. The wiſeſt way for us, with regard to all revealed truth, is to receive it as revealed, not preſuming to be wiſe above what is written.

I do not mean by this to condemn the Council of Nice, for though there may not be a great deal in ſome of the expreſſions uſed by them, their only meaning was to expreſs their diſapprobation of the opinion of Arius, which was certainly ſubverſive of the proper divinity of Chriſt. But I apprehend we ought to condemn the making emblems of this truth, ſuch as a triangle inſcribed in a circle. This at leaſt is of no uſe, or more probably it is always pernicious; and indeed I ſhould think it a direct breach of the ſecond commandment: nay, I think attempting to explain it by the powers of created intelligences is no way ſafe or proper, although done by ſome very worthy men. For an example, when the trinity is ſuppoſed to correſpond with power, intellect and will, in the human nature.

It is not the uſual way, on moſt ſubjects, to introduce or anſwer objections, before propoſing the proof; yet I believe it will be the moſt proper method, on the ſubject we are now treating. The difficulty here does not ariſe from the weakneſs, uncertainty, or obſcurity of the proof; but from the power of prejudice. In order therefore to prevent or deſtroy prejudice, it will be beſt to conſider what objections lie in the way of the doctrine. The rather indeed, that all objections to the doctrine itſelf are reducible to one—that it is contrary to reaſon, abſurd, inconceivable, or impoſſible. It is ſurpriſing to think with what inſolence and triumph ſome have pretended to treat this ſentiment, ſaying it is a contradiction that God ſhould

be both one and three, at the ſame time. But notwithſtanding the great confidence with which enemies to the truth talk upon this ſubject, I am ſincerely of opinion, that their confidence never could be more miſplaced. Let us examine the matter coolly and impartially. When men ſpeak of a thing as againſt reaſon, and yet pretend to believe in Revelation, the meaning muſt be, that it is ſo manifeſtly abſurd and ſelf-contradictory that no proof can ſupport a revelation which contains it. But in order to this it muſt be a thing altogether within the compaſs of our reaſon and judgment; if otherwiſe, the firſt unexperienced dictate of reaſon, is nothing at all; neither for, nor againſt it. The ſtate of nature and experimental philoſophy did ſcarcely ever ſhew things to be what men imagined them before; neither is it at all wonderful that revelation ſhould inform us of what we could not have ſuſpected. The uſe of revelation indeed implies this. Therefore the common diſtinction of ſyſtematical divines, is far from being either obſcure or improper, that things may be above reaſon, and yet not contradictory to it.

By this expreſſion above reaſon, may be underſtood two things—beyond the power of reaſon to diſcover, and above the reach of reaſon to comprehend. In the firſt ſenſe, it would be abſurd to controvert it, and even in the other, if it was carefully attended to, and prejudice laid aſide, there would be little difficulty. The enemies of the truth always put more in the idea than is intended, or ought to be contained in it. The juſt ſtatement of it is preciſely this, we believe a fact which is fully proved and authenticated, although there are ſome circumſtances, as to its cauſe and conſequences, that we do not underſtand. There are many things in theological, moral, and natural knowledge in which the caſe is the very ſame. I believe that God is a ſpirit, and that there are alſo created ſpirits different from God, wholly unembodied, and yet I have very obſcure and indiſtinct ideas, if any idea properly at all, of what a ſpirit is, and the manner of its operation. Carteſians believe that a ſpirit has no extention, and that a hundred thouſand of

them may be in the ſame place; which by the bye is an example of the abſurdity with which men talk upon ſubjects which they do not underſtand; for according to them, place is a relation incompetent to a ſpirit, and therefore it is as abſurd to ſay that a ſpirit is in a place, as that three are in the ſame place. The whole matter is above our comprehenſion, and no man can make me underſtand either how diſtinct ſubſtances can occupy the ſame place, or even the Newtonian opinion, that a ſubſtance, ſimple and indiviſible, can be in every place. From which it is demonſtrable that there may be many circumſtances relating to things of great moment and certainty, that are to us totally incomprehenſible. In natural things I believe that the ſeed rotting in the ground, is the mean of producing the blade of the future ſtalk; but if you aſk me how this is done, or how the moiſt earth can have any influence either on the mortification or the growth, I know nothing at all about it.

Therefore though we ſay that the trinity in unity is incomprehenſible, or above reaſon, we ſay nothing that is abſurd or contrary to reaſon; ſo far from it, I may ſay rather it is conſonant to reaſon and the analogy of nature that there ſhould be many things in the divine nature that we cannot fully comprehend. There are many ſuch things in his providence, and ſurely much more in his eſſence.

But when our adverſaries are preſſed upon this ſubject, they ſay ſometimes it is not an incomprehenſible myſtery we find fault with, but an apparent contradiction that God ſhould be three and one. We know very well what numbers are, and we know perfectly, whatever is three, cannot be one, or one three. But this is owing to great inattention, or great obſtinacy. We do not ſay there are three Gods and yet one God; three perſons and yet one perſon; or that the Divine Being is three in the ſame ſenſe and reſpect that he is one; but only that there is a diſtinction, conſiſtent with perfect unity of nature. I apprehend great reſerve and ſelf-denial is our duty on this ſubject. It has ſometimes been ſaid, why ſhould we doubt whether there can be three perſons in one nature,

when we ourselves are an example of an incomprehensible union of this nature in our persons. If this be used merely as an illustration, and to shew that the thing is possible and credible, I have no objection to it; but if it be carried farther, it is improper and dangerous.

Upon the whole, we ought to consider the objection against this doctrine as altogether ill founded, and be ready to receive with all humility the Revelation of God upon this subject just as he has been pleased to communicate it.

The second thing to be attended to is the proof of the doctrine, as contained in the Holy Scriptures. On this I will just, very shortly, consider the scripture proof of the Trinity in general, and then, at some more length, point out the proofs of the proper Deity of Christ the Son; upon which last, as is natural to suppose, the controversy hath always chiefly turned.

The proofs of the Trinity in general may be taken (1) From the form of baptism; we are commanded to baptise in the name of the Father, and of the Son, and of the Holy Ghost.

As baptism is the initiating profession taken from all converts, it seems evidently to point at the great object of worship and obedience. Neither do I see at all how it can be accounted for, that the Son and Holy Ghost should be classed and put upon the same footing with the Father—but upon the supposition of this truth. And indeed their very designation leads us to an equality of rank, it is not said in the name of God, and the name of Jesus of Nazareth, or his human name, but in the name of the Father and the Son. Those who will consider this matter attentively will find more in it than perhaps at first sight appeared. Baptism is certainly the badge of Christianity, the seal of God's covenant. With whom then is a covenant made? Doubtless with those in whose name we were baptised, and therefore our covenant God, is most fully described by Father, Son, and Holy Ghost. To this you may add, that the Apostle Paul seemed plainly in the first Epistle to the Corinthians, to consider baptism as pointing at something very different from any relation

that a minister could sustain. 1 Cor. i, 13, 14, 15. "Is "Christ divided? was Paul crucified for you?" &c.

2d. The proof of the Trinity in general may be taken from the form of solemn benediction, the love of God the Father, the grace of our Lord Jesus Christ, and the communion of the Holy Ghost, be with you all. As in the former instance, the three are taken in as the object of worship and obedience, here they are plainly conjoined as the source of blessedness.

3d. The proof of the Trinity in general may be taken from an express passage of scripture, 1 John, v, 7. "there "are three that bear record in heaven," &c.

LECTURE X.

WE come now to prove the doctrine of the Trinity from the proofs of the proper Deity of the Son and Spirit. On this the controversy has chiefly turned, and especially the first, the divinity of the Son; because if this was admitted, it would be to very little purpose to object against the other; for this reason we find that ever since the first starting of the controversy it has been litigated with great zeal and warmth on both sides; this was to be expected, as it must evidently appear an article of the utmost moment to both. I must observe, however, that the controversy has been chiefly managed by Arians till of late years. Now it seems to me there are but very few proper Arians, the greater number of the oppposers of the truth are Socinians.

You are not to expect that I should go through the whole of this controversy, which has been carried to so great a length; the passages of scripture adduced on both sides are more numerous than we would suppose; and the criticisms, objections and answers, are exceedingly voluminous. You will say then, the controversy must

needs be difficult and obſcure.—The conſequence is not juſt, for whenever there is a ſtrong bias and inclination one way, it is eaſy for ingenious men to perplex and lengthen out a diſpute. The great matter is the objection I mentioned in the preceding diſcourſe. If men be once fully ſatisfied that this thing is not impoſſible or incredible, and be willing to aſſent to the account of the nature of God without prejudice, as it ſtands in his own word, I do not think there is any uncertainty in it at all. I ſhall ſtate to you the chief heads of any importance that have been uſed.

1. The name of God, and his titles—the moſt tranſcendent and peculiar—are given to Chriſt. Through the Old Teſtament, the name of Jehovah or Lord, but particularly the firſt, is given to one who is often called an angel, and the angel of the covenant; and by this manner of ſpeaking in ſeveral paſſages, muſt be diſtinguiſhed from God the Father, as in the 110th pſalm, the Lord ſaid unto my Lord.—This therefore muſt be underſtood of Chriſt. The angel who appeared to Hagar, Gen. xvi, and that appeared to Jacob at Bethel, Gen. xiii, are both called God.—In Exodus, chap. iii, an angel is ſaid to have appeared to Moſes, at the buſh, and yet this angel ſays, I am the God of your father, the God of Iſrael, who delivered the law on mount Sinai, and yet Stephen ſays, Acts vii. 38, that it was an angel that ſpoke unto Moſes, upon mount Sinai, and was with the fathers: but what ſerves to apply many of theſe paſſages in the moſt preciſe manner, is comparing Numb. xxi. 8. with 1 Cor. x. 9. in the firſt it is ſaid, that the Iſraelites tempted God, and ſpake againſt God, and that therefore he ſent among them fiery ſerpents.—In the other paſſage the apoſtle Paul affirmeth, that this was Chriſt. "Let us not tempt Chriſt, as ſome of them alſo tempted, and were deſtroyed of ſerpents." See farther, Pſalm ii. 12. "Thou art my Son, this day have I begotten thee." Pſal. xlv. 7. "Thy throne, O God, is for ever and ever," &c. which paſſage the apoſtle Paul applies to Chriſt. 1 Heb. i. 8. "But unto the Son he ſaith, thy throne O God, is for "ever and ever," &c. Another proof may be taken from Prov. viii. 22. The deſcription of wiſdom—again, in Iſa. vi.

from the beginning, " In the year that king Uzziah died," &c. This paſſage is expreſsly applied to Chriſt, by the apoſtle John xii. 41, when, having cited the paſſage, he ſays, " theſe things ſaid Iſaiah," &c. the truth is, there is hardly any writing in the Old Teſtament, but by comparing it with the New, we may draw a proof of the divinity of Chriſt.

2. The thing itſelf—the propoſition that Jeſus Chriſt is God, is contained in the moſt explicit terms, not in one, but in many places of ſcripture—not in figure, but in plain ſimple language, John i. 1. " In the beginning was " the word," &c. Phil. ii. 6. " Who being in the form of " God, thought it not robbery to be equal with God,"&c. John x. 30. " I and my Father are one." 1 John v. 20. " this is the true God, and eternal life." It would be endleſs to mention all fetches and imaginations of men under the power of prejudice, to evade theſe texts: but I only call to your mind what was before mentioned—Cleave to either ſide of the queſtion, and ſay, Whether or not the ſcriptures have plainly affirmed Chriſt's divinity ?—It is not only the affixations, but the reaſoning upon ſome of them, that fixes the ſenſe, as in the Philippians. And in that affirmation, I and my Father are one, it is undeniable that the Jews underſtood him in that ſenſe, for it is added, " they immediately took up ſtones to ſtone him," &c. It has been often ſaid by reaſoners upon this ſubject, ſuppoſing it was the deſign of the ſcripture to affirm the divinity of Chriſt, it does not appear what plainer or ſtronger words could have been uſed.

3d. The moſt diſtinguiſhing and eſſential attributes of the true God are given to Chriſt. I ſhall mention only his eternity, immutability, omniſcience, omnipreſence and omnipotence. It is not eaſy to conceive any attribute incommunicable if theſe are not. Eternity ſeems plainly to be aſcribed to him, Prov. viii. 22. Rev. i. 8. &c. and in the famous paſſage, Mic. v. 2. " Whoſe goings forth have been of old from (1) everlaſting." Indeed I reckon the frequent appellation of Jehovah is a ſufficient proof of this; the word is derived from what ſignifies exiſtence—Exod. iii. 14. John viii. 38. (2) Immutability, Heb. i. 10. Heb. xviii.

8. "Jesus Christ the same yesterday, to day, and for ever." (3) Omniscience. John xvi. 30. "Now we are sure that "thou knowest all things;" and again, John xxi. 17. "Lord thou knowest all things," &c. It is remarkable, that the knowledge of the heart is asserted in several passages, to distinguish the true God, 1 Kings, viii. 39. "Therein thou only knowest the hearts of the children of "men."—and John xvii. 10. "I the Lord, search the "hearts, and try the reins," &c. yet this very perfection our Lord claims to himself, Rev. ii. 23. and the apostle John testifies that he knew all men, John ii. 24.—and knew what was in man, John ii. 25.—this is further confirmed, iv. 12, 13. "The word of God," &c.

(4) Omnipresence. Matth. xviii. 20. "Where two or "three are gathered together in my name," &c. Matth. xxviii. 20. "Lo, I am with you always," &c.

(5) Omnipotence. Col. i. 17. "By him all things con-"sist." Creation is ascribed to Christ, John i. 3. "All "things were made by him," &c. and in the same chapter, verse 10, "and the world was made by him." Heb. i. 2. "by whom also he made the world." Col. i. 15, 16, 17. "who is the image of the invisible God," &c. The argument from creation, is very strong.—It is the first and great relation we stand under to God, nor can we conceive any thing that more properly, or in a more distinguishing manner it characterizes the true God, who pleads it so often, to distinguish himself from the vanities of the Gentiles, Psal. xix. 1. "The heavens declare the glory of "God, and the firmament sheweth his handy word."

5. The fifth and last proof of the divinity of Christ, may be taken from divine worship being commanded to be given to him, and being accepted by him without reproof, when it is expressly rejected by the inferior ministers of Providence. It is commanded to be given to him, John iii. 22, 23. "The Father himself judgeth no man." Phil. ii. 5. "Wherefore, God, hath highly exalted him," &c. It is actually given him by the wise men, Matth. ii. 11. By the rulers of the Synagogue, Matth. v. 8. By women of Canaan, Matth. xv. 25. By the disciples in general, Matth. xx. 5. And you see that worship is rejected by an angel, Rev. xxii. 8, 4.

LECTURE XI.

I PROCEED now ſhortly to conſider the proofs of the divinity of the Holy Spirit. The firſt thing neceſſary here, is to eſtabliſh the perſonality of the Spirit.—That he is properly a perſon or ſubſtance, and not merely a power, gift or qualification. The name of ſpirit, in all languages ſignifies a wind or breath.—It is ſuppoſed this word is choſen to repreſent divine things, or the divine nature, becauſe it bears ſome reſemblance to what is unſeen, and yet infinitely powerful. The wind is made uſe of to repreſent the Holy Ghoſt, and to ſignify angels and the ſouls of men, and alſo the gifts and graces of the Spirit.—That when the Holy Ghoſt is ſpoken of, a perſon or ſubſtance is meant, as diſtinguiſhed from any grace or qualification he may poſſeſs or beſtow, may be eaſily made to appear from many paſſages of ſcripture, John xiv. 16. "And I "will pray the Father, and he ſhall give you another Com-"forter, that he may abide with you for ever; even the "Spirit of truth, whom the world cannot receive." John xvi. 13. "When he the Spirit of truth is come," &c. 1 Cor. xii. 4. "There are diverſity of gifts, but the ſame "Spirit," &c. The form of baptiſm alſo proves the ſame thing, as well as all thoſe paſſages that ſpeak of giving the Spirit—reſiſting the Spirit, &c.

That the Holy Ghoſt is truly and properly God, I think appears with great evidence from the form of baptiſm, now that we have fully proved the divinity of Chriſt, whoſe perſonality we cannot doubt. The Holy Ghoſt being joined with the Father and the Son, carries the ſtrongeſt conviction with it that he is of the ſame nature with both. The ſame thing may be ſaid of the form of ſolemn benediction.

The divinity of the Holy Ghoſt ſeems to be eſtabliſhed in Acts, v. 3. where Peter ſays to Ananias and Sapphira, "Why hath Satan filled thine heart," &c. We might alſo from ſeveral paſſages ſhew the divine attributes given to the Spirit, as omnipotence, Pſalm 119. "Whither ſhall "I go from thy Spirit," &c. Omniſcience, Cor. ii. 10. "The Spirit ſearcheth all things even the deep things of "God," nay, creation ſeems to be aſcribed to him as well as the Son, Gen. i. 2. It is ſaid "the Spirit of God mo-"ved upon the face of the waters," and Job xxxiii. 4. "The ſpirit of the Lord hath made me, and the breath "of the Almighty hath given me life."

There were in the ancient churches conſiderable controverſies about the expreſſion of the articles of faith upon this ſubject. The very words of ſcripture, John xv. 26. are, that the Spirit proceedeth from the Father. He is alſo called the Spirit of the Son, and the Spirit of Chriſt, Rom. viii. 9. Gal. xiv. 6. Phil. i. 14. 1 Pet. i. 11. both the Father and the Son are ſaid to ſend the Spirit, John xv. 26. John xvi. 7. Gal. iv. 6. Luke xxiv. 49.

Therefore the uſual way of ſpeaking, and that in all the ancient ſymbols and confeſſions is, that the Son is begotten of the Father, and the Holy Ghoſt proceedeth from the Father and the Son. If any one ſhould preſume to enquire farther into the meaning, or aſk the difference between being begotten and proceeding, I ſhould willingly and chearfully confeſs my ignorance, and that I believe all others are equally ignorant, and that every attempt to ſay more than is actually contained in ſcripture is not only impoſſible but hurtful. There was a very violent diſpute between the Latin and Greek churches whether it was proper to ſay the Holy Ghoſt proceeded from the Father and Son, or from the Father only. The whole current of antiquity, and the whole Latin churches are for the former, as well as the Proteſtants in general; but it is not a modern controverſy.

I proceed to conſider ſome of the objections againſt the reaſoning above, and unleſs I enter into the criticiſms or particular texts, they may be all reduced to the reaſoning on the titles and attributes. They object that ſome

of the higheſt titles were not given to the Son, as—the higheſt or moſt high—the Almighty or Supreme over all—one God and Father of all—one God of whom *are* all things. But it is eaſy to anſwer that none of theſe titles are greater or more diſtinguiſhing than, as has been ſhewn, do really belong to Chriſt, and that ſome of thoſe mentioned are alſo aſcribed to Chriſt; ſuch as the Almighty, and God over all. So that they are obliged to have recourſe to the meaneſt quibbles, to interpret away theſe texts. As for the expreſſion one God, and the title one God, the Father, of whom are all things—they are plainly uſed in a diſtribution of perſonal acts or prerogatives, one God the Father, *of* whom are all things, and one Lord Jeſus Chriſt *by* whom are all things.

The other objection is, that ſuch titles are aſcribed to him in a lower ſenſe than to the Father. Nothing could ſuggeſt ſuch an objection as this except the power of prejudice. They muſt firſt take for granted their own ſentiments, before they can perceive any ſuch thing; beſides many of them are ſuch as do not admit of a proportion in this way—ſuch as creation—omniſcience—omnipotence.

LECTURE XII.

Of the Decrees of God.

WE have this ſtrong aſſertion in ſcripture, "can any "by ſearching find out the Almighty," &c. If the nature of God has ſomething in it altogether unſearchable to us, ſo muſt alſo his decrees. It is certainly proper and neceſſary for divines to know all that can be known on this ſubject, and therefore the ſtudy of a whole life would be well beſtowed on it, if it were ſure of ſucceſs. Yet I apprehend a caution is not unneceſſary while we are entering upon it. Our

great wisdom consists in receiving, admitting, remembering and applying, whatever is clearly revealed in scripture, with regard both to the nature and government of God; at the same time, we ought to restrain an impatient curiosity, and guard against unnecessary, inexplicable and hurtful questions, on these subjects. The scriptures do not contain any thing that is unfit for us to know. If it seemed necessary to God to reveal the universality of his providence and the certainty of his purpose, we ought without doubt to believe and improve it. On the other hand, let us not presume to go any farther than he hath pointed out to us the way. Whatever he hath covered with a veil it would be both rashness and impiety to attempt to penetrate. It is therefore my design to state this matter to you in as precise and scriptural a manner as I am able, although I must necessarily use several of the theological systematical phrases, because without them the various opinions could neither be sifted nor explained.

The expression itself "the decrees of God" is in a great measure, if not wholly, technical. In the Old Testament, indeed, there are several expressions particularly relating to the frame and constitution of nature, which are translated in the English Bible decrees, as in the Prov. viii. 29. "When he gave to the sea his decree," &c. and in the second Psalm, speaking of the raising Messiah to his throne—"I will declare the decree." In all of these I believe (for I have consulted most of them) it is the same word that is frequently or usually translated—*statute*, and to be sure has a meaning somewhat similar to that of the word used in theology, that is, it signifies the order or purpose of God in nature and providence. In the New Testament there is no expression on this subject that has been translated decree, though some of the *phrases* might have been so translated. The expressions in the New Testament are *council*, *purpose*, *determinate council*, *foreknowledge*; and when it relates to the state of man, *choosing*, *ordaining*, *predestinating*. I enter upon the criticism of the Greek words, because I think it is manifest they are not only translated well into English, but that they are mostly, if not wholly, of the same import that they are usually un-

derſtood to poſſeſs. I ſhall now ſhew you a ſample of the Socinian criticiſm on Acts xiii. 48. It is ſaid *osoi esan tetagmenoi eis zoeen aionion*, which they tranſlate, "as many as were ſet in order, or well prepared for eternal life, believed." They obſerve that *tetagmenoi* means, ſet in order like a diſciplined army. But it is manifeſt that the word here means *particularly appointed* and *ordained*. By comparing together the ſeveral expreſſions uſed, the meaning that we muſt aſſign to the whole is, that the plan of Providence and grace, as well as the ſyſtem of nature, muſt be ſuppoſed to be fixed and determined, and not looſe and uncertain, till the event, or till one thing be aſcertained or determined by another.—That things are not to God as they are to us, to whom things future have no certainty or ſtability, but that as far back as we can carry our ideas they were known, and therefore certainly ordained. Or as ſome expreſs it, that every thing that comes to have a tranſient exiſtence in time, had as it were an original eternal pre-exiſtence, in the divine mind. Yet after all, you ſee there is ſomething in the expreſſion *decrees* or *purposes*, which ſeems to take its riſe only from our own ſituations and imperfections.

Men are obliged to meditate, concert and digeſt their plans of future conduct, before they begin to act, and then it is called their purpoſe, reſolution, or deſign, as diſtinct from the actual execution. From this we ſeem by analogy to borrow the divine decrees. Yet every thing that implies, or ariſes from ignorance, uncertainty, weakneſs, or imperfection, muſt be as much as is in our power, ſeparated and abſtracted, when we ſpeak of the decrees of God.

This leads us to obſerve, that it has often been remarked by divines, that we are not to conſider the divine decrees, in ſo far as they are acts of the divine will, as being any thing different or diſtinct from the divine nature. There are ſome who have uſed the expreſſion immanent decrees, a phraſe which I confeſs I do not in the leaſt degree underſtand the meaning of, and therefore I can nei-

ther affirm nor contradict it; without doubt we are to separate every thing belonging to created weakness. We are not to suppose that God needs forethought to discover, or time to digest his plans, or that by any act of his will he seeks information, or seeks or receives gratification from any thing without him—If by calling the decrees of God immanent acts, it is meant to deny these, it is so far just. But when it is affirmed that the acts of the divine will, are the same with the divine nature, as if this explained the difference between divine and human volitions, this I confess is to me quite incomprehensible.

In what shall be further offered on this subject, I shall follow this method:—

1. Speak a little of the object of the divine decrees.
2. Of the order of the decrees.
3. Of the character, quality, or attributes of the decrees as given in scripture.
4. Of their uses.

I. Let us consider the object of the decrees, and of this but a little, because it will occur again where it is of moment to examine it; yet it will throw some light upon some parts of the doctrine, to observe,

(1.) That the objects of the divine decrees, are strictly and properly universal; so much so indeed, as not to admit of any exception, or shadow of exception—all creatures, and all their actions, and all events. Let us vary it as we please, still it relates to every action, and every mode of the action, and every quality that can be attributed to it—whatsoever comes to pass. The reason of this is plain—whatever we shall think fit to say upon the connexion or influence of one creature or thing upon another, from which all the difficulty and confusion arises, yet every such thing, and that connexion itself, as much as the things to which it relates, is the object to which the divine foreknowledge, and the divine purpose extended. One would think that men should be agreed on this point; and probably they are so, if they understood one another; all but those extravagant persons, as they may well be called, who finding themselves hard pressed by the arguments drawn from the di-

vine prefcience, have thought it beft to deny the foreknowledge of God altogether, or affirm that nothing that is future can poffibly be certainly, or any more than conjecturally known, till it happens.—But this fentiment is fo repugnant to fcripture, and indeed to the common fenfe and reafon of mankind, that few have ftrictly and fincerely defended it, though fome have occafionally and hypocritically advanced it.

(2.) With refpect to the object of the divine decrees, it muft be admitted, that there is fome difference between the light in which fome events and actions are to be confidered, and others—The great difficulty indeed, and that which will fpeedily fet bounds to our enquiry on the fubject, is to fhew wherein the difference confifts; yet it is equally certain, from revelation and reafon, that natural good and evil, and moral good and evil, are to be confidered as not in the fame fenfe, the object of divine appointment. This leads us to the

IId. General head, which was to confider the order of the decrees. Many things may be, and many things have been faid upon this fubject—Divines who have publifhed fyftems, have generally exercifed their ingenuity in giving what they call an order of the decrees. The chief thing fuch writers have in view, is to form a conception for themfelves and others, with regard to, and to account for, the divine purpofes, with regard to the final ftate of man. The orders which have been laid down by different writers, are fo very numerous, that they all feem to me to labor under, and equally to labor under, this prodigious weaknefs, that they repref ent the Supreme Being as varying and marfhalling his views, and comparing as men do, which yet is acknowledged to be wrong.—They alfo feem to carry in them the fuppofition of fucceffive duration; yet fucceffive duration we have generally agreed not to afcribe to God, although, of any other kind of exiftence, we have not the leaft conception. It is impoffible for me to go through all the different arrangements that have been made by particular authors: I fhall therefore only give you a fuccinct view of the chief differences of divines of different claffes—Calvinifts, Arminians, Socinians.

Calviniſts are divided upon this ſubject into two ſorts; commonly called Supralapſarians and Sublapſarians. The reaſon of the names are, from one being of opinion that God in ordaining the elect and reprobate conſidered man as before the fall, and the other as fallen and in a ſtate of guilt.

The firſt ſay that in laying down a plan, what is laſt in the execution is firſt in the intention, that God purpoſed to glorify his mercy and juſtice in the everlaſting felicity of ſome, called veſſels of mercy; and in the everlaſting perdition of others, called veſſels of wrath. That to accompliſh this purpoſe he reſolved to create the world, to put man in a condition in which he would certainly fall; to ſend the Redeemer in the fullneſs of time to carry on the whole plan of ſalvation, as we now find it in the oracles of truth.

The Sublapſarians ſay, that the order of purpoſing ſhould be the ſame as the order of execution. That the decrees of God being eternal, there can no order of time be applied to them, but that which takes place in the execution. Therefore they ſay that God propoſed to make man innocent and holy, with powers to preſerve his innocence, but liable to fall; that he foreſaw the fall, and permitted it, and from the corrupted maſs freely choſe ſome as the objects of mercy, and left others to periſh in the ruins of their apoſtacy, and that to accompliſh this purpoſe he reſolved to ſend the Saviour, &c.

It is eaſy to ſay ſomething very plauſible on each ſide of the queſtion between the two: it ſeems very ſtrong what Sublapſarians, ſay that the idea of time and order belongs only to the execution: but why do they alſo ſpeak of order, when it is certain that as far as we can clearly ſpeak of deſign or purpoſe at all, the means ſeem to be deſigned for the end, and not the end for the means. The Supralapſarians have alſo this evident advantage of all the reſt that they have the ſovereignty of God *directly*, for what all the reſt are obliged to come to *at laſt*. It muſt be obſerved that the ſtrongeſt Supralapſarians do conſtantly aſſert the holineſs and juſtice of the divine providence. If you aſk them how they reconcile the divine juſtice with the ab-

ſolute and certain event they confeſs they cannot explain it; but they affirm that all that the others ſay to this is perfectly trifling, and leſs reaſonable than their confeſſion of ignorance.

The Arminians ſay that God decreed to create man innocent; and that after he had fallen he reſolved for ſatisfaction to juſtice, to appoint a Saviour; that he decreed to ſave thoſe that ſhould believe and repent; to give to all ſufficient grace for that purpoſe; and finally to ſave and reward thoſe who ſhould endure to the end. It is plain that whatever reaſon they may offer with great plauſibleneſs for ſeveral things, when taken in a ſeparate and detached view, nothing can be weaker than the Arminian ſcheme, conſidered as a ſyſtem of the divine purpoſe, becauſe they leave out or ſuſpend the purpoſe at every ſtage.

As to the Socinians they do generally deny the reality of the decrees altogether, and ſay that the event is wholly uncertain, and ſuſpended upon the will of the creature—as many of them as maintain or admit the foreknowledge of God, do it contrary to their other principles.

If I were to ſay any thing upon this ſubject (I mean the order of the decrees) I would ſay nearly as Pulit, in his ſyſtem as contained in the notes upon Rulet, has ſaid, which is in ſubſtance this, that God reſolved from all eternity to manifeſt his own glory, and illuſtrate his moral excellence, wiſdom, power, holineſs, juſtice, goodneſs and truth, in the production and government of a created ſyſtem. That for this purpoſe the whole ſyſtem, and all the facts of which it conſiſts and their dependance one upon another, and the order itſelf in which they were to take place, were ordained. If the whole, then certainly every particular part as fully as the whole, is the object of one abſolute decree. In this view they are all upon a footing; at the ſame time we do not pretend to diſpute that things are ordained with conſiderable difference; but this difference it is hard or impoſſible for us to explain. There is certainly a difference between the ordination of things natural, and thoſe which are ſinful or holy. The very ſinful diſpoſition, conſidered as becoming a part of the general plan, is certainly as

holy an ordination as any other, yet the ſcripture teaches us to conſider this as a thing quite different from God's determining to ſend his Son into the world to ſave ſinners. It ſeems to be a matter inſiſted on in the ſtrongeſt manner in ſcripture, that the evil or guilt of every creature is to be aſcribed to the creature, as to its proper and adequate cauſe: at the ſame time it ſeems fully as plain that whatever connexion there may be between one evil and another, the choice of the veſſels of mercy is free and unconditional, and that the rejection of others is imputed to the ſovereignty of God, Luke x. 21. John xii. 39. That the choice of the veſſels of mercy is free and ſovereign, appears from the words of ſcripture; from their univerſal ſtate—dead in treſpaſſes and ſins; from their viſible character, and from the means of their recovery—I mean the omnipotence of divine grace.

LECTURE XIII.

I NOW proceed to the third thing upon this ſubject, which was to conſider the character, qualities and attributes of the decrees of God, as they are given to them in ſcripture in expreſs terms, or manifeſtly founded upon ſcripture truths, and particularly upon ſuch truths as relate to the decrees. Of this the chief are what follow.

(1) Eternity. We have expreſs mention made, Eph. iii. 11. of God's eternal purpoſe: and believers are ſaid to be choſen in Chriſt before the foundation of the world. The laſt expreſſion is of the ſame import with the firſt; for whatever is before the beginning of time is to be conſidered as eternal. This indeed is eſſential to the divine purpoſe, inſeparable from the very meaning of the word decree; and if I am not miſtaken one of the chief things we are to be taught by it is, that whatſoever comes to paſs, in revolving years, is not looſe, but was fixed in the divine

mind before time itself began. It is exceeding difficult however, at once to restrain an improper curiosity, and to speak with precision on the subject, and with safety.—Some have raised a question, whether there is not a necessity of supposing the existence and the nature of God, as previous to his decrees. To which it is commonly said, that there is a priority of order, though not of time; a priority like that of the cause to its inseparable effect; as the sun is the cause of light, yet the creation of the sun would not be before or antecedent to the light; they are inseparable and necessarily existent. One would think there was nothing amiss in this way of speaking, or of saying in consequence of it, that the decrees are to God's nature as an eternal effect to an eternal cause; and yet I am afraid there is here what we find in many subjects of theology, a mixture of repugnant ideas intricate and difficult, eternity, and time—beginning, and no beginning. When we speak of an effect of a cause, we cannot do otherwise than think of something produced, some alteration, or something that was not before. This is the case with all the similitudes brought to illustrate it, as the creation of the sun and the co existence of light, or another made use of by some of the refined Arians, who meant to say the Son is produced by the Father, as an eternal effect of an eternal cause—as the print of a man's foot in the sand is caused by his setting down his foot, but not posterior in point of time. But all this is truly absurd when speaking of God, because it includes some definite idea of what might and did begin to take place. I should be apt to think that one of the chief reasons why any thing is revealed to us concerning the decrees of God, is to give us an awful impression of his infinite majesty, his supreme dominion, and the absolute dependance of every creature upon him; so that it is enough for us to say, that his purpose is before all worlds, antecedent to all time or the idea of succession, being indeed entirely inseparable from the idea of his existence.

(2.) The next thing to be considered is the liberty of God in his decrees. They are according to the council of his own will. Almost all the systems say that God did

moſt wiſely, moſt juſtly, and moſt freely, decree whatſoever comes to paſs.

The chief objection to this ariſes from what uſed to be called many years ago the Beltiſtian ſcheme, of which, whatever chance traces may be ſeen in former authors, Le bnitz is the proper author. Of this ſcheme it is the leading part, or rather the foundation of the whole, to ſay that God, infinitely wiſe and good, muſt neceſſarily chooſe the beſt in every thing. That therefore of all poſſible ſyſtems this which he has choſen, becauſe it has taken place, muſt neceſſarily be the beſt, and he could not chooſe any other; ſo that from the unalterable rectitude of his nature, he is as invariably determined by his neceſſity as any of his creatures. This boaſted demonſtration would be defenſible perhaps, were it not that its very foundations are good for nothing. Its ideas are not applicable to the divine Being; better and beſt are definite terms, and actual compariſons. We ſay a thing is better when it is preferable to ſome others, and beſt when it is a thing abſolutely preferable to all others. Now with what propriety can it be ſaid that in the plans that were poſſible to infinite wiſdom and power there is one beſt. Have we comprehenſion ſufficient to ſee this, and therefore to ſay it? It ſeems to me that a demonſtration might be given to the contrary. The whole ſyſtem of creation is either finite and temporal, or infinite and eternal. If it be finite, it ſeems abſurd to ſay that it would not be made better by being made larger and ſimilar; and if it was not from eternity it might have been made many thouſands of years ſooner. If on the contrary it be infinite and eternal, the poſſible combinations of an infinite ſyſtem are truly infinite, and there cannot be a beſt. The patrons of this ſcheme when preſſed with theſe difficulties have recourſe to what they ſhould have begun with, the incomprehenſibleneſs of time and ſpace, and ſay that we cannot apply any of the ideas of ſooner or later to eternity, or larger or leſſer to ſpace. The impoſſibility of uniting infinite to definite qualities ſhould have prevented them from ſaying that of all poſſible ſyſtems infinite wiſdom muſt chooſe the beſt; but when we ſpeak of time

and ſpace, nothing is more clear, than that if at any time a thing has exiſted ten years, I can ſuppoſe that it exiſted twenty years; and that if any thing be of finite extent, I can ſuppoſe it enlarged as well as diminiſhed. So great is the obſtinacy of people in adhering to their ſyſtems, that Dr. Clark reduces an antagoniſt to the abſurdity of affirming, that though the univerſe were moved ten millions of leagues in any direction, it would ſtill be in the ſame place; and another writer of ſome note, ſays, either that the thing is impoſſible that the world could have been created ſooner than it was, or that if it had been created 5000 years ſooner, yet it would have been created at the ſame time. Beſides this ſcheme ſeems to me to labor under two great and obvious difficulties—that the infinite God ſhould ſet limits to himſelf, by the production of a created ſyſtem —It brings creation a great deal too near the Creator to ſay it is the alternative of Omnipotence. The other difficulty is, that it ſeems to make ſomething which I do not know how to expreſs otherwiſe, than by the ancient ſtoical fate, antecedent and ſuperior even to God himſelf; I would therefore think it beſt to ſay, with the current of orthodox divines, that God was perfectly free in his purpoſe and providence, and that there is no reaſon to be ſought for the one or the other beyond himſelf.

Let us conſider the wiſdom and ſovereignty of his decrees; I put theſe together, not that they are the ſame, but that they ſeem, though not oppoſite, to limit each other in their exerciſe, and the one of which is often to be reſolved into the other. Wiſdom is aſcribed to the decrees of God; or rather, wiſdom indeed is particularly aſcribed to God himſelf, as one of his eſſential perfections, and therefore by neceſſary conſequence, it muſt belong to his providence in time, and his purpoſes from eternity.—The meaning of this as far as we can conceive, when uſed by us, is, that the beſt and nobleſt ends are deſigned, and the beſt and moſt ſuitable means in accompliſhing theſe ends. And indeed all the wiſdom that appears in the works and ways of God when carried into effect, muſt be ſuppoſed in the original purpoſe. But how ſhall we join the ſovereignty with this? Sovereignty ſeems to reſolve the whole

into mere will, and therefore to ſtand oppoſed to the wiſdom of the proceeding; accordingly there are ſome who in ſpeaking of the decrees, reſt them entirely and totally on the ſovereignty of God, and ſay that not only the reaſons are not made known and unſearchable to us, but that there is no reaſon at all of the preference of one thing to another, but the divine will. There have been ſome writers who have founded the very nature of virtue and vice upon the divine will. Thoſe who think otherwiſe, uſually ſay, it is making the decrees not abſolute only, but arbitrary—not only unſearchable, but unreaſonable: and indeed the founding every thing upon mere will, ſeems to take away the moral character of the Deity, and to leave us no meaning when we ſay God is infinitely wiſe and holy, juſt and good. I am however inclined to think that thoſe who have gone the furtheſt upon the ſovereignty of God, only meant that we could not, or ought not, to dive into the reaſon of the Divine Providence, that his will ought to bound all our enquiries, and be a full and ſatisfactory anſwer to all our difficulties; and if it be taken in this way, it will not be eaſy to overthrow it.

If we look into the ſcripture doctrine upon this ſubject, we ſhall, if I miſtake not, ſee both the wiſdom and ſovereignty of God aſſerted in the ſtrongeſt terms, united together and founded upon one another, Job ix. 4, "he is "wiſe in heart,"—he is ſaid to be God only wiſe, Rev. xvi. 27. 1 Tim. i. 15. Jude 25. Eph. iii. 10. and Rom. xi. 38. ſpeaking expreſsly of the decrees, "O the depth," &c. at the ſame time, the ſovereignty of God is aſſerted, and events reſolved into it, Luke x. 21. "In that hour Jeſus "rejoiced in ſpirit," &c. I would here call your attention to two paſſages, very remarkable; one in the Old Teſtament, the other in the New. The book of Job it is agreed by interpreters, was compoſed expreſsly upon the difficulty of Providence, ariſing from the afflictions of good men, and the proſperity of the wicked; but in that book, after the reaſoning of Job and his friends, when God himſelf is brought in ſpeaking out of the whirlwind, in the 38th and 39th chapters, he ſays not one word, either of the wiſdom or juſtice of his proceedings; but in language

infinitely majeſtic, diſplays and dwells upon the greatneſs of his power.—It is true indeed, the beautiful poetical diſplay of the order of creation, may be ſaid to imply in it wiſdom as well as power; but if ſo, all that is there advanced, is to illuſtrate the power and wiſdom of the Creator, and by that means to impoſe ſilence on the raſh challenges of the creature.

The other example is from the New Teſtament, where the Apoſtle, after introducing an objection againſt the divine purpoſe as to the ſtate of man, does not offer any other reaſon, but has recourſe to the ſovereignty of God, Rom. vii. 18, 19, 20. "Therefore it is not of him that "willeth," &c.

It will be perhaps hard or impoſſible for you to enter into this at once, as I confeſs it was to me in early life; but I now ſee more of the neceſſity of ſubjecting ourſelves to the Divine Sovereignty, and making uſe of it to reſtrain and repreſs our raſh and curious enquiries. It is finely imagined in Milton, that he makes a part of the damned in hell to torment themſelves with unſearchable queſtions about fixed fate, foreknowledge abſolute. It is certain that we cannot now fathom thoſe ſubjects—if we ever ſhall to eternity. As I hinted formerly, it is of conſiderable uſe to obſerve the analogy there is between the courſe of nature, providence and grace. There are a vaſt number of things in which we muſt needs reſolve the laſt queſtion, ſo to ſpeak, into the ſovereignty of God. Why did God ſee it fit to people this world ſo very thinly? Why does the improvement of human arts proceed ſo very imperfectly? Why is the chief bleſſing that God ever beſtowed yet unknown to a vaſt number of the human race? The ſtate of a ſavage tribe and of a cultivated ſociety, how do they differ in the ſame climate? Why was ſo great a part of this vaſt continent for ſo many ages a howling wilderneſs—a dwelling for wild beaſts, and a few human creatures little leſs ſavage than they?—Why is one perſon born into the world a ſlave, and another a monarch? Even with regard to morals, which are the ſource of the higheſt dignity and the higheſt happineſs—I could ſuppoſe one born in a great, but profligate

family, ſupplied with all the means of indulgence, ſolicited by the worſt examples, and beſet by intereſted flatterers; and I could ſuppoſe another born of pious parents, with the moſt amiable example, the moſt careful inſtruction, the moſt regular government—why are there ſo vaſt advantages given to the one, and ſo hard a trial impoſed on the other? muſt we not ſay, "even ſo Father," &c. In temporal and ſpiritual, natural and perſonal circumſtances, there is every where to be ſeen much of the ſovereignty of God.

IV. The next character of God's decrees is that they are juſt, and that they are holy. He is righteous in all his ways, and holy in all his works; and it is the union of righteouſneſs and holineſs with the moſt unſearchable depth of wiſdom that gives occaſion to the adoration, Rev. xiii. 8. "Great and marvellous," &c. Nothing can be more manifeſt than that all the calamities which God in his Providence inflicts on earth, and the future judgments which he will inflict on the ungodly, are repreſented as acts of juſtice. The only difficulty or objection that lies in the way of this, ariſes from the next particular, to which we will therefore proceed, viz.

V. That the decrees of God are fixed, abſolute and unchangeable; that which he hath ordained ſhall certainly come to paſs, and nothing can oppoſe it, ſubvert it, or take its place. Here then the difficulty ariſes full upon us, how ſhall we reconcile this with the free agency of the creature, with the guilt of ſin, or the righteouſneſs of the puniſhment of ſin? yet this is affirmed by all ſound divines, as in the confeſſion of faith, chap. iii. ſect. 1. "God from all eternity did by the moſt holy and wiſe counſel of his own will freely and unchangeably ordain whatever comes to paſs; yet ſo as thereby neither is God the author of ſin, nor is violence offered to the will of the creature; nor is the liberty or contingency of ſecond cauſes taken away, but rather eſtabliſhed." This ſubject has exerciſed the reaſon of men in all ages, ſo far as it has been propoſed to them, but particularly that of divines. The ſubject is dark and intricate as any body may eaſily perceive.

It is remarkable what weak things ſometimes men of ſenſe will ſay upon ſuch ſubjects, when it ſeems neceſſary to them to ſay ſomething in favor of their own hypotheſis. One writer propoſes to himſelf to reconcile this difference, and ſays, God foreſees and predetermines actions in different ways, and each according to its own nature; that he foreſees neceſſary actions as neceſſary, free actions as free, and contingent events as contingent. This is juſt ſaying nothing at all, and it had been better to have ſaid nothing than to have ſaid it. Every body knows that as far as theſe different kinds of actions and events take place in the ſyſtem, they are ſo ordained of God; But it behoved this author to ſhew how any action could be free, or any event contingent, upon the ſuppoſition of the Divine Providence or decree.

Others have attempted to ſolve the difficulty by founding the decrees upon foreknowledge, and this upon God's diſtinct and perfect view of every perſon's diſpoſition, and how men will determine in every circumſtance in which they can be placed. But this is liable to two objections (1) that foreknowledge makes no difference as to decrees, for whether God conſidered the thing as a conſequence of another or not, if he foreſaw the conſequence, he admitted and ordained that event as a part of the general ſyſtem. The other objection is, that it takes for granted the ſyſtem of what is called moral neceſſity, which brings back the ſame difficulty with re-doubled force. It is remarkable that the advocates for neceſſity have adopted a diſtinction made uſe of for other purpoſes, and forced it into their ſervice; I mean moral and natural neceſſity—they ſay natural or phyſical neceſſity takes away liberty, but moral neceſſity does not—at the ſame time they explain moral neceſſity ſo as to make it truly phyſical or natural. That is phyſical neceſſity which is the invincible effect of the law of nature, and it is neither leſs natural nor leſs unſurmountable if it is from the laws of ſpirit, than it would be if it were from the laws of matter. To ſee how ſome people are loſt upon theſe ſubjects, you may obſerve that the great argument that men are determined by the ſtrongeſt motives, is a mere equivocation, and what logici-

ans call *petitio principii.* It is impoſſible even to produce any medium of proof that it is the ſtrongeſt motive, except that it has prevailed. It is not the greateſt in itſelf, nor does it ſeem to be in all reſpects ſtrongeſt to the agent; but you ſay it appears ſtrongeſt in the mean time—why? Becauſe you were determined by it: alas you promiſed to prove that I was determined by the *strongest motive*, and you have only ſhown that I had a *motive* when I acted. But what has determined you then? can any effect be without a cauſe? I anſwer—ſuppoſing my ſelf-determining power to exiſt, it is as real a cauſe of its proper and diſtinguiſhing effect, as your moral neceſſity; ſo that the matter juſt comes to a ſtand, and is but one and the ſame thing on one ſide and on the other.

But even ſuppoſe the ſyſtem of neceſſity true, the difficulty of reconciling it with the guilt of ſin, and the righteouſneſs of God's judgment, is as great as upon any ſuppoſition whatever. Others have made uſe of a metaphiſical argument to reconcile foreknowledge with liberty. They ſay, when any thing is done in time, it only ſhews the futurity of the action, as the ſchool men ſay. It was a true propoſition from all eternity that ſuch a thing would be done, and every truth being the object of the divine knowledge, God's foreſeeing it was no more the cauſe of it, than a man's ſeeing another do a thing at a diſtance is the cauſe of its being done. But even this does not ſatisfy the mind, as the difficulty ariſes from the certainty of the event itſelf, as being inconſiſtent with the freedom of the agent, not the way in which it comes to be known.

It deſerves particular notice that ſeveral able writers have ſhewn, that with reſpect to the moſt difficult part of the decrees of God, all the ſeveral ſects of Chriſtians at bottom ſay the ſame thing, except that claſs of Socinians who deny the omniſcience and foreknowledge of God altogether, and they are ſo directly oppoſite to the letter of ſcripture that they deſerve no regard.—The Arminians ſay, that God has decreed that all that he foreſaw would believe and repent, ſhould be ſaved—for which purpoſe all have ſufficient grace given them. But could not omnipotence have given them effectual grace to overcome

their obſtinacy? Yes without doubt; and are there not ſome, that had as obſtinate and profligate natures as thoſe that periſh, overcome by Divine power?—Yes it is not eaſy to deny this—that he did not give the effectual grace to ſome, and gave it to others. So that they muſt at laſt ſay, "even ſo Father," &c.

It is more eaſy to ſhew that the Supralapſarians and Sublapſarians are at bottom of the ſame principle. All then have this difficulty before them—to account for the divine purpoſe conſiſtently with the guilt of ſin.

But I would go a little farther and ſay the difficulty is the ſame in natural as it is in revealed religion, and the ſame in the courſe of nature as in both. The certainty of events makes as much againſt common diligence in the affairs of life, as againſt diligence in religion. The fates which the ſtoics of old held, was called the *ignava ratio* of the ſtoics.

For my own part I freely own, that I could never ſee any thing ſatisfactory in the attempts of divines or Metaphyſicians to reconcile theſe two things; but it does not appear difficult to me to believe preciſely in the form of our confeſſion of faith—to believe both the certainty of God's purpoſe and the free agency of the creature. Nor does my being unable to explain theſe doctrines form an objection againſt one or the other.

LECTURE XIV.

OF the covenant of works and the fall of man—This ſeems to be the next thing in order.—That I may treat of it as conciſely as poſſible, I will make the following obſervations.

1. It is juſtly and properly by divines, conſidered as a covenant. The word *covenant* is not indeed made uſe of by Moſes in giving the hiſtory of the fall, for which ma-

ny reaſons may be aſſigned. The ſcripture does not ſo much limit the phraſe as fix the thing itſelf, which we now expreſs by it. The word covenant is uſed with latitude in ſcripture. Thus, Jer. xxxiii. 20, 25. "Thus ſaith the "Lord if you can break my covenant." &c. It may be obſerved that there muſt of neceſſity be ſome impropriety in calling any tranſaction between God and man a covenant, becauſe it muſt differ conſiderably from an engagement of perſons equal and free. But as far as there can be a covenant relation between God and man, it evidently took place here. The giving a ſpecial command, with a threatening annexed, does evidently imply in it ſuch a covenant.

2. It ſeems juſt and proper to ſuppoſe that merely abſtaining from the tree of knowledge of good and evil was not the only duty preſcribed and demanded by God, but that the demand extended to univerſal obedience.

The Jewiſh Rabbies ſay, that God gave Adam ſix precepts; (1) to worſhip God; (2) to do juſtice; (3) not to ſhed human blood; (4) not to make uſe of idols or images; (5) not to commit rapine and fraud; (6) to avoid inceſt. But all this is without the leaſt proof.

3. We may conſider the choice of the command for trial, not to eat of the tree of knowledge of good and evil. This may give occaſion to many conjectures, and likewiſe to many ſolid remarks. It is conjectured by many that the tree had in it a noiſome quality that made the body liable to corruption, as God often orders his commands ſo that obedience to them is of itſelf happineſs, and diſobedience is miſery. If we ſuppoſe the eating this tree had nothing in itſelf either good or evil, and it is aſked why God thought fit to ſuſpend the fate of the human race on a poſitive precept?—It may be anſwered, firſt as an act of ſovereignty, to which we have no right to object. (2) It might alſo be more proper for the trial of obedience, as the mere authority of God would be the ſanction. (3) It was a juſt and natural acknowledgment that the creature held all created comforts of God. (4) There were then ſo few relations that there could be no trial upon the precepts of the ſecond table.

4. It appears that Adam, in the covenants of works, was to be conſidered as the federal head and repreſentative of the human race, as he was then the natural head. By the manner in which the human race was to deſcend from him, the puniſhment inflicted upon him, muſt of courſe deſcend to them. If we ſuppoſe that God might juſtly create an order of beings like to what man is, to deſcend from one another, and to propagate the nature which he had, the matter could not have fallen out otherwiſe, in caſe of ſin, than it did.

5. Let us conſider the import of the threatening. In "the day thou eateſt thereof, thou ſhalt ſurely die:" That temporal death was to be underſtood by it, and all the ſufferings preparatory to death, muſt neceſſarily be admitted. That it ſuppoſes alſo ſpiritual death, or the ſeparation of the ſoul from God, is a neceſſary circumſtance in the whole of this matter. The expreſſion, Gen. iii. 22, "Behold the man is become like one of us," &c. is by no means to be taken as if God was afraid they would eat of the tree of life, and thereby become immortal. The greateſt part of interpreters conſider theſe words as ſpoken by way of deriſion, and as it is alſo probable that this tree had much in it of a health-giving quality, it was not proper that men devoted to ſo many ſufferings ſhould be permitted the uſe of it. And as a ſacrament, it was to be refuſed to thoſe who had broken the covenant, and were therefore unworthy of the ſign.

Of the Fall.

Before we ſpeak farther of the fall of man by the breach of the Covenant of works, it may be expected that we ſhould conſider a little the introduction of ſin or moral evil in general. Why did God permit ſin and the train of evils that follow it? This has been a queſtion that has exerciſed enquirers from the beginning, and eſpecially under the goſpel. I have treated a little upon this in the diſcourſe upon the decrees, and ſhall only further drop a few hints. Some ſay that it was a neceſſary conſequence of creating free agents; but there are many objections to

this. It is neither certain that it was a neceſſary conſequence, nor that there is any ſuch worth in the free agency of the creature as to deſerve to be preſerved, at the price of this evil and its train. Some have ſaid that the evil, natural and moral, was neceſſary to the perfection of the whole, as the ſhade of a picture to the beauty of the whole piece. This is the ſubſtance of the Beltiſtian ſcheme, the foundation of which I mentioned before with the objections againſt it. I ſhall now only add, that upon this ſyſtem it is neceſſary to ſuppoſe that all the good, natural and moral, that the univerſe could poſſibly admit, is to be found in it. This is exceedingly difficult to believe from appearances, and it is impoſſible to ſupport it without laying God himſelf under the chains of neceſſity. It is certainly infinitely preferable to take ſcripture truths juſt as they ſtand, that God is infinitely holy—has teſtified his abhorrence to ſin—and therefore cannot be the author of it—that he has notwithſtanding moſt juſtly permitted it—and that he will illuſtrate his own glory by it—but that the diſpoſition of his providence and grace is to us unſearchable.

There is mention made in ſcripture of the angels that ſinned; from which it appears that ſin was introduced among them. The ſcriptures have not informed us of many circumſtances on this ſubject, which as uſual, men of fertile inventions have endeavored to ſupply by conjectures, or to determine from very ſlender evidence. Some have even preſumed to determine the number of the fallen angels, or at leaſt their proportion to thoſe that ſtood, from Rev. xii. 3, 4. "And there appeared another "wonder in heaven, and behold a great red Dragon ha-"ving ſeven heads and ten horns, and ſeven crowns upon "his heads, and his tail drew the third part of the ſtars of "heaven, and did caſt them to the earth." But this is a miſapplication of the paſſage in that prophecy, which belongs to the viſible church on earth. Some have ſaid the ſin of the angels was envy—ſome impiety or luſt; but the greater number pride; and this laſt ſeems to have the moſt truth in it, not becauſe we know any thing certain of the circumſtances of their rebellion, but be-

cauſe pride or ſelf-ſufficiency ſeems to be the eſſence or ruling part of all our ſin.

We do not know the time of their fall, nor indeed with much certainty the time of their creation. We only know that their fall was before that of man —and that God paſſed by the angels that ſinned—and that they are reſerved in chains under darkneſs to the judgment of the great day.

Some have exerciſed themſelves in conjecturing how long our firſt parents continued in the ſtate of innocence. Some ſuppoſe they fell upon the firſt day of their creation —others that they continued in innocence ſome years. There is nothing ſaid in the book of Geneſis that can determine this point with certainty, nor is it of much moment, could it be determined.

Eve is ſaid to have been tempted be the ſerpent, and by many paſſages of ſcripture it is put beyond a doubt, that it was by the Devil or Prince of the fallen angels. It ought not to be underſtood allegorically. Probably he made uſe of this creature as the fitteſt form in which he could appear. Many have ſuppoſed it was one of the bright fiery ſerpents that are ſeen in Arabia (and ſome parts of the eaſt) and that he appeared to Eve as an angel, which would the more eaſily account for the deception. If this opinion is embraced, we muſt however ſuppoſe that the ſerpent was more glorious before the fall than ſince, in his appearance ; and indeed it is probable that moſt, or all the creatures, were more excellent in their kind, before than after the fall.

But what we are chiefly to attend to, is the conſequence of the fall upon Adam and his poſterity. As to themſelves, they loſt a great part of the image of God, in which they were created. They became the objects of divine diſpleaſure ; their eyes were opened, and they felt ſhame for their nakedneſs ; were ſtruck with the alarm of an evil conſcience ; were driven from the terreſtrial paradiſe ; expoſed to many ſufferings which were to end in death ; and obliged to labor on the accurſed ground. Some few of the ancients have believed that our firſt parents periſhed eternally ; but that has been far from the general belief,

which has been, that as the firſt promiſe was made to them they underſtood and improved it, and received conſolation by it.

As to the effect of Adam's ſin upon his poſterity, it ſeems very plain that the ſtate of corruption and wickedneſs which men are now in, is ſtated in ſcripture as being the effect and puniſhment of Adam's firſt ſin, upon which it will be ſufficient to read the epiſtle to the Romans, chapter 5, from the 12th verſe and onward. And indeed when we conſider the univerſality of the effects of the fall, it is not to be accounted for any other way, than from Adam's being the federal head of the human race, and they ſinning in him, and falling with him, in his firſt tranſgreſſion.

The firſt and chief of theſe effects is the corruption of our nature—that man now comes into the world in a ſtate of impurity or moral defilement. We will firſt conſider the ſcripture proof of original ſin, and then ſay, as far as we have warrant from ſcripture, what it is and the manner of its communication.

I ſhall firſt mention the following paſſages of ſcripture, Gen. v. 6, and 21. "And God ſaw," &c. Pſalm xxxvii. 5. "Behold I was ſhapen in iniquity," &c. John iii. 6. "That which is born," &c. Rom. viii. 7, 8. Eph. ii. 3. "And were by nature the children of wrath, even as "others."

After conſidering the above paſſages, let me obſerve to you that in this, as in moſt ſubjects, the general ſtrain of the ſcripture is fully as convincing as particular paſſages. The univerſal command of making atonement—Children receiving the badge of the covenant—the tenor of the promiſes, "I will take away the ſtony heart out of your fleſh"—the force of the Pſalmiſt David's prayer, "create within me a clean heart,"—and many others of the ſame import; but above all this doctrine of our Saviour' John iii. 3. "Verily, verily," &c. To all this you may add experience. The univerſal and early corruption of men in practice is a ſtanding evidence of the impurity of their original.

What is the hiſtory of the world but the hiſtory of human guilt? and do not children from the firſt dawn of reaſon ſhow that they are wiſe to do evil; but to do good they have no knowledge!

As to the nature of original ſin and the tranſmiſſion of it, I think a few words may ſuffice. We certainly diſcover in mankind, not only a diſpoſition without reſtraint to commit errors of a groſs nature, but in general an attachment to, and love of the creature, more than the Creator. It may not be improper here to conſider the queſtion, whether the whole nature is corrupt, ſo that whatever we do is ſin. It will be, I think very eaſy to ſettle this point, if the meaning of the enquiry be clearly underſtood. If the ſupreme deſire of the mind, and leading principle be wrong, then every thing that is directed by it muſt have the nature of ſin.

Thoſe who repreſent it in this light, do by no means aſſert that every act in every part of it is evil. Such as to ſpeak truth—to do juſtice—to ſhew mercy, which certainly an unholy man may do. Nay I ſuppoſe even the greateſt ſinner that ever was, ſpeaks twenty true words, where he ſpeaks one that is falſe. But what is meant to be aſſerted is, that every action of an unregenerate man is eſſentially defective as a moral duty, becauſe flowing from a wrong principle, and tending to a wrong end,—Let us ſuppoſe a man inflexibly ſober and temperate from a concern for his health, or a covetous deſire of ſparing his money; and one ſhould ſay there is no true virtue in this. It would be ridiculous to ſay that we affirmed that ſobriety was not a virtue, or that the perſon concerned ſinned in being ſober. This will appear by expreſſing the ſentiment in another form. Every body would underſtand and approve it, if we ſhould ſay, there is no virtue at all in that miſer who ſtarves his belly, or clothes himſelf with rags, only to fill his purſe.

As to the tranſmiſſion of original ſin, the queſtion is to be ſure difficult, and we ought to be reſerved upon the ſubject. St. Auguſtine ſaid it was of more conſequence to know how we are delivered from ſin by Chriſt, than

how we derive it from Adam. Yet we shall say a few words on this topic. It seems to be agreed by the greatest part that the soul is not derived from our parents by natural generation, and yet it seems not reasonable to suppose that the soul is created impure. Therefore it should follow that a general corruption is communicated by the body, and that there is so close a union between the soul and body that the impressions conveyed to us through the bodily organs, do tend to attach the affections of the soul to things earthly and sensual. If it should be said, that the soul, on this supposition, must be united to the body as an act of punishment or severity; I would answer, that the soul is united to the body in consequence of an act of government, by which the Creator decreed, that men should be propagated by way of natural generation. And many have supposed that the souls of all men that ever shall be, were created at the beginning of the world, and gradually came to the exercise of their powers, as the bodies came into existence, to which they belong.

LECTURE XV.

Of Sin in general and its demerit; and of actual sin, and its several divisions.

OF sin in general, and moral evil, we may observe, that the scripture uniformly represents it to us in the most odious light. Of God it is said, "he is of purer eyes than to behold iniquity." It is said to be that which his soul hates. To grieve him—to dishonor him—and to provoke his wrath. And though we must exclude from our minds, every thing, in these frequent expressions, that belong to human passions or weakness, the just and

legitimate inference to be drawn from it is, the great and unſpeakable evil of ſin.

As the evil of ſin appears from every page of the ſacred oracles; ſo it alſo appears in the cleareſt manner from its effects, and the miſery that follows it. All natural evils are the fruits of ſin—all the ſufferings in the valley of terror ſhoot from it. And if we lay down the righteouſneſs of Providence as a principle, Dr. Butler has ſhewn in his analogy, that the puniſhment, and therefore the guilt of ſin is very great—that ſometimes very great and laſting ſufferings are the conſequence of acts, one would think not the moſt atrocious. The contagion of ſin—The rage of violent paſſion—And the terror of conſcience in ſome inſtances, all tend to prove the evil of ſin.

One can ſcarcely have a clearer idea of the evil of ſin, than by comparing the effects of piety and virtue, ſo far as our own experience has enabled us to form an idea of them, with the effects of univerſal corruption and depravity in any ſociety.

Here perhaps it may be proper juſt to mention the queſtion, whether it is proper to ſay there is an infinite evil in ſin? I would anſwer it thus, there is not a ſingle argument againſt it, only this, that the actions done in time by a finite creature cannot have in them an infinite evil; but this is not the thing denied: for all the ſyſtems with one voice ſay, that it is not infinite in all reſpects, otherwiſe all ſins would be equal, which indeed it is ſaid that the Stoics anciently have held. But as far as there can be meaning to us in the expreſſion, it muſt be proper to ſay the evil of ſin is infinite: not only becauſe when we conſider the ſeveral particulars that illuſtrate the evil of it, we ſee no end to them, but becauſe ſin is properly an oppoſition to the nature, and a tranſgreſſion of the law of God. Now his nature being infinitely excellent, and the obligation on us ariſing from his infinite perfections in himſelf, his full property in, and abſolute dominion over us being inconceivably great, I reckon that there muſt be the very ſame juſtice and propriety in ſaying that there is an infinite evil in ſin, as an infinite goodneſs in God.

Sin is explained in general in our Catechiſm, to be a want of conformity unto, or tranſgreſſion of the law of God. In this definition of ſin it is divided into ſins of omiſſion or of commiſſion. The law of God is a perfect rule, and every deviation from it is ſin, whether in the matter of the duty, or principle from which it ought to flow. An action to be truly good, muſt be compleat in all reſpects. Hence ſome obſerve that actions truly good are equally good, becauſe they are perfect, they compleatly fulfil the law, and are performed at the very time when it was required. But ſins are not equally evil, ſome are very much aggravated in compariſon of others from many circumſtances eaſy to imagine—Let one juſt conſider the diſtinction of ſins, with a remark or two upon each. (1.) Sins of omiſſion and commiſſion. We are not to ſuppoſe that ſins of omiſſion are conſtantly, and by their nature, leſs heinous than ſins of commiſſion. There are ſome duties ſo important, and the obligation to which are ſo ſtrong and manifeſt, that the omiſſion of them is an offence as much aggravated as any that can be named, and much more ſo than ſome ſins of commiſſion. A total and habitual neglect of God's worſhip, is certainly much more criminal than ſome raſh injurious expreſſions, which are ſins of commiſſion. (2.) Sins voluntary and involuntary. All ſins may be ſaid to be in ſome ſenſe voluntary, as lying properly in the diſpoſition of the heart and will. Some are of opinion that original ſin itſelf is voluntary, the corrupt bias from the corrupted frame not taking away the liberty neceſſary to moral action, and the ſin lying in the conſent given to the ſolicitation. It is however certain that all actual ſin ſhould be conſidered as voluntary, being ſo in its nature. But ſome ſins are ſaid to be involuntary, when they are from inattention, and ſometimes when they are the effect of long habit, ſo that they are done without deliberation and without reflection. Theſe are not any way excuſeable on that account; becauſe that want of attention is a very great ſin, and the power of habit has been contracted by acts of wickedneſs.

3. There are ſome ſins of ignorance, ſome againſt light—light in general is an aggravation of ſin. Ignorance total and invincible, takes away all ſin—But ig-

norance may often be eaſily prevented; and ſometimes ignorance may be ſo circumſtanced as to aggravate ſin, as when it ariſes from an averſion and hatred to the light. This is nearly connected with the opinion of the innocence of error. There are great numbers who will needs have it, that error in judgment cannot be criminal, if the perſon is ſincerely of that opinion which he profeſſes or avows. This is called by biſhop Warburton, the maſter prejudice of this age. But it is plain that error muſt juſt be conſidered as ignorance. To ſay that a perſon miſtakes his duty with perfect innocence, is to ſuppoſe God has not given ſufficient means of diſcovering and diſtinguiſhing truth from falſehood.

There are ſeveral other diviſions of ſins that may be introduced; ſuch as ſins in thought, in word, and in deed. Filthineſs of the fleſh and of the ſpirit; occaſional and reigning ſins: but as they have little difficulty in them, ſo the explanation of them is no way neceſſary to the explaining of evangelical truth; for which reaſon I will not diſcuſs them.

There are ſome maxims in eſtimating the morality of actions, that, though generally admitted, carry ſome difficulty in them, when applied univerſally; as for example —that a ſin is the more highly aggravated when it is committed with little temptation; and that a virtuous action is more laudable, when it overcomes the greateſt temptations. If we extend this to inward, as well as outward temptation, which is commonly done, it ſeems to take much from the merit of true holineſs in eminent ſaints, and to annihilate altogether the excellency of the Divine holineſs. The maxim muſt therefore, either be a miſtake, or miſapplied. One of the contraries that flows from it, is certainly true, viz. that an action is not praiſe-worthy, in proportion as the contrary is vicious. It is one of the higheſt degrees of vice to be without natural affection, and to neglect the common care of family and relations: but to take care of them, has but very little that is praiſe-worthy in it. Whenever we find difficulty in theſe things, it is but reaſoning them up to the queſtion of liberty and neceſſity, the dependance and activity of the creature.

we ſhould always ſtop ſhort, as being above our comprehenſion.

There is one thing very remarkable, that in the ſcriptures, the ſin of our nature is always adduced as an aggravation of our guilt; but looſe perſons in principle and in practice, are apt to produce it as an extenuation of the actual tranſgreſſion which proceeds from it. Nor, I believe, is there any way by which men can be taken off from ſuch views, but by a thorough work of conviction, and the power of divine grace. Therefore a miniſter of great piety and judgment once ſaid to me, "No man will cordially believe the doctrine of ſalvation by grace, contained in our Catechiſm and confeſſion, unleſs he is born of God. I can ſhew by reaſon that the fall of man, and the corruption of our nature is contained in the ſcripture. I can ſhew that it is entirely correſpondent with the courſe of nature and the ſyſtem of Providence. But we need hardly expect that it will be received and approved till the pride of the heart is brought down, and the ſinner laid at the foot-ſtool of divine mercy."

Another remark I ſhall make, and this alſo borrowed from a friend, that every error or departure from the truth might be traced back to a want of conviction, and not having a due ſenſe, of the evil of ſin. Notwithſtanding all the boaſt of concern for moral virtue, and the repeated objection that the doctrine of ſalvation by grace leads to licentiouſneſs and favors immorality, it is an unhumbled ſpirit that makes ſuch perſons oppoſe the truth. Self-righteouſneſs is eaſily traced back to this—all the merit of works may be reduced to it—had ſuch perſons a proper ſenſe of the extent and ſpirituality of the law of God, they would never think of truſting in themſelves that they are righteous: and did they feel the obligation upon every intelligent creature, ſupremely to honor the living and true God, they would ſee the evil of refuſing it; but would never think of pleading any merit from an imperfect performance of that which is ſo perfectly due.

In the laſt place, as to the inability of man to recover himſelf by his own power, though I would never attempt to eſtabliſh a metaphyſical ſyſtem of neceſſity, of which

infidels avail themſelves in oppoſition to all religion nor preſume to explain the influence of the Creator on the creature; yet nothing is more plain from ſcripture or better ſupported by daily experience, than that man by nature is in fact incapable of recovery without the power of God ſpecially interpoſed. I will not call it a neceſſity ariſing from the irreſiſtible laws of nature. I ſee it is not a neceſſity of the ſame kind as conſtraint; but I ſee it an impoſſibility ſuch as the ſinner never does overcome. A late author in Scotland thinks he has diſcovered the great wheel that connects the human ſyſtem with the univerſal kingdom of God: that this race of creatures were ſuffered or ordained to come into exiſtence, to be a ſtanding monument to all other intelligences through the univerſe, that a rational creature once departing from his allegiance to his Creator, never could again recover it, but by his own Almighty power and ſovereign grace.

LECTURE XVI.

Of the Covenant of Grace.

WE come now to ſpeak of the Covenant of Grace. This, taking it in a large ſenſe, may be ſaid to comprehend the whole plan of ſalvation through Jeſus Chriſt. I am not to mention every thing that belongs to this ſubject; but before entering directly into the conſtitution of the covenant of grace, it will be proper to ſpeak a little of the doctrine of ſatisfaction for the guilt of a creature.

As to the firſt of theſe—Was ſatisfaction or ſome atonement neceſſary? would it have been inconſiſtent with divine juſtice to have pardoned ſinners without it? might not the ſovereignty and mercy of God have diſpenſed with the puniſhment of ſin, both in the ſinner and in the ſure-

ty? The agitation of this queſtion, and the zeal that is ſhewn by ſome upon it, I cannot help ſaying, ſeems to ariſe from an inward averſion to the truth itſelf of the ſatisfaction, and the conſequences that follow from it. What does it ſignify, though any one ſhould admit that God by his ſovereignty might have diſpenſed with demanding ſatisfaction, if notwithſtanding it appears in fact that he has demanded and exacted it? "that without ſhedding of blood there is no remiſſion," and "that there is no other name," &c. Whether it has been ſo ordained, becauſe to have done otherwiſe would have been inconſiſtent with the divine perfections, or becauſe ſo it ſeemed good unto God, ſeems at leaſt an unneceſſary if not an indecent queſtion. We have an infinite concern in what God has done, but none at all in what he might have done. On what is really difficult upon this ſubject, we may however make the few following remarks.

(1) From its actually taking place as the will of God, we have good reaſon to ſay it was the wiſeſt and beſt; the rather that we find many of the higheſt encomiums on the Divine perfections, as ſhewing in this great diſpenſation his power, wiſdom, mercy and juſtice. His wiſdom in a particular manner is often celebrated, Eph. iii. 10. Rom. xi. 33. At the ſame time it is proper to obſerve the harmony of the divine attributes; that the juſtice of God appears more awful in the ſufferings of Chriſt than if the whole human race had been devoted to perdition; and his mercy more aſtoniſhing and more amiable in the gift of his Son, than it could have been in the total remiſſion of all ſin without any ſatisfaction, had it been poſſible.

(2.) There is a particular proof of the neceſſity of ſatisfaction that ariſes from the death of Chriſt, conſidered as intimately united with the Divine nature, which it has been already proved that he poſſeſſed. Can we ſuppoſe that ſuch a meaſure would have been taken, if it had not been neceſſary? Can we ſuppoſe that the eternal Son of God would have humbled himſelf thus, and been expoſed to ſuch a degree of temptation, and ſuch amazing ſufferings, if it had not been neceſſary?

3. All the accounts given us in ſcripture of the nature of God, his perfections and government, confirm this ſuppoſition. The infinite juſtice and holineſs of his nature are often mentioned in ſcripture; that he hates ſin, and cannot look upon it but with abhorrence, and particularly that he will by no means ſpare the guilty. It is ſometimes objected here, that juſtice differs from other attributes; and that its claims may be remitted, being due only to the perſon offended. But this which applies in part to man, cannot at all be applied to God. I ſay it applies in part to man, becauſe a matter of private right, independent of the public good, he may eaſily paſs by. But it is not ſo with magiſtrates or public perſons, nor even with private perſons, when they take in the conſideration of the whole. Beſides, when we conſider the controverſy about the juſtice of God and what it implies, we ſhall ſee the greateſt reaſon to ſuppoſe what is called his vindictive juſtice, viz. a diſpoſition to puniſh ſin becauſe it truly merits it even independently of any conſequence of the puniſhment, either for the reformation of the perſon, or as an example to others. The idea of juſtice and guilt carries this in it, and if it did not there would be an apparent iniquity in puniſhing any perſon for a purpoſe different from his own good.

II. The ſecond queſtion upon the ſatisfaction is, whether it was juſt and proper to admit the ſubſtitution of an innocent perſon in the room of the guilty. This is what the Socinians combat with all their might. They ſay it is contrary to juſtice to puniſh an innocent perſon; that God muſt always treat things as they really are, and therefore can never reckon it any proper atonement for ſin to puniſh one that never committed any ſin. Before I ſtate the reaſoning in ſupport of this fundamental doctrine of the goſpel, I will firſt briefly point out the qualifications neceſſary in ſuch a ſubſtitution. (1) The ſecurity undertaking muſt be willing; it would certainly be contrary to juſtice to lay a puniſhment upon an innocent perſon without his conſent. (2) He muſt be free and independent having a right over his own life, ſo that he is not accountable to any other for the diſpoſal of it. (3) The perſon having

the demand must be satisfied and contented with the substitution, instead of personal punishment. (4) That the surety be truly able to make satisfaction in full. (5) That it be in all respects as useful, and that the sufferer be not lost to the public. (6) Some add that he be related to and of the same nature with the guilty. This is generally added from the constitution of Christ's person, and in that instance surely has a great degree of suitableness, but does not seem to me to be so necessary as the other particulars for establishing the general principle.

Now supposing all these circumstances, vicarious satisfaction for sin seems to me easily and perfectly justifiable: to make this appear, attend to the three following observations.

(1) There is nothing in it at all contrary to justice. If any innocent person were punished against his will, or laid under a necessity of suffering for the cause of another, it would evidently be repugnant to the idea of justice. But when it is done, as by the supposition, willingly and freely, injustice is wholly excluded. If we could indeed suppose ignorance and rashness in the undertaking, so that he consented to what he did not understand, there would be injustice, but this also is wholly excluded in the case before us.

(2) There is nothing in it contrary to utility, because it has precisely the same effect in demonstrating the evil of sin in the one case as in the other. In any human government it certainly serves as much to ratify the law, and in many cases the exacting the debt with rigor of a surety is a more awful sanction to the law, than even the satisfaction of the offending party. We have not in all history I think, an instance of this kind so striking as the lawgiver of the Lorrians, who had made a law that adultery should be punished with the loss of both the eyes. His own son was shortly after convicted of the crime; and to fulfil the law, he suffered one of his own eyes to be put out, and one of his Son's. Every body must perceive that such an example was a greater terror to others, than if the law had been literally inflicted on the offender. After having mentioned these two particulars, I

obſerve that the thing is in a moſt preciſe and exact manner laid down in ſcripture. It is impoſſible to invent expreſſions, that are either more ſtrong or more definite than are there to be found. It is an obſervation of ſome of the Socinian writers that the word ſatisfaction is not to be found in ſcripture, and in this they often triumph: but nothing can be more ridiculous, for ſatisfaction is a modern term of art, and unknown in that ſenſe to antiquity. But can there be any thing more plain, than that it is intended to expreſs the very meaning ſo fully and ſo variouſly expreſſed, both in the ſcriptures and the heathen writers? The word in the Old Teſtament moſt frequently uſed is, atoning, making atonement for ſin, or for the ſoul. What could be more plain than not only the great day of atonement, but the daily ſacrifice in which certain men were appointed to repreſent the people of Iſrael, and lay their hands on the head of the devoted beaſt and confeſs the ſins of the people, which had not any other intelligible meaning than the transferring the guilt from the ſinner to the victim. The ſprinkling the blood in the Old Teſtament upon the horns of the altar, whence by alluſion the blood of Chriſt is called the blood of ſprinkling, carries this truth in it, in the plaineſt manner—and the prophecies of Iſaiah, chap. liii. 5, "he was wounded "for our tranſgreſſion," &c. "When he ſhall give his ſoul an offering for ſin," &c. But were there the leaſt obſcurity in the type, the truth as ſtated in the New Teſtament, would put the matter out of all doubt. The expreſſions are ſo many that we cannot, and we need not enumerate them all—"redeemed—bought with a price—redeemed not with corruptible things, as ſilver or gold, but with the precious blood of Chriſt—This is my blood ſhed for many, for the remiſſion of ſins—he gave himſelf a ranſom for all—unto him that loved us, and waſhed us from our ſins in his own blood."

I would juſt add here, that as by the conſtitution of our nature, and our being made to deſcend in a certain ſucceſſion by natural generation, there is a communication of guilt and impurity from Adam; ſo we have in human ſociety, and indeed inſeparable from it, the idea of com-

munication by natural relation of honor and ſhame, happineſs and miſery, as well as the cleareſt notion of voluntary ſubſtitution. We ſee that the worth and eminent qualities of any perſon, give luſtre and dignity to his poſterity; and wickedneſs or baſeneſs does juſt the contrary. We ſee that men may eaſily, and do neceſſarily, receive much pleaſure from the happineſs of their relations, and miſery in ſympathy with their ſufferings. And as to voluntary ſubſtitution, it is as familiar to us as any tranſaction in ſocial life. It is true there are not many inſtances of men's being bound in their life for one another; for which ſeveral good reaſons may be aſſigned. There are not many men of ſuch exalted generoſity as to be willing to forfeit life for life; it is rarely that this would be a proper or adequate ſatisfaction to the law; and it would not be the intereſt of human ſociety, commonly to receive it. Yet the thing is far from being inhuman or unpractiſed—There are ſome inſtances in ancient times, in which men have procured liberty for their friends, by being confined in their room. And both in ancient and modern times, hoſtages delivered by nations, or public ſocieties, are obliged to abide the puniſhment due to their conſtituents.

(3.) The third queſtion on the ſubject of ſatisfaction is, Whether it was neceſſary that the redeemer or mediator ſhould be a divine perſon? It may be aſked, whether an angel of the higheſt order, who was perfectly innocent, might not have made ſatisfaction for the ſins of men? Perhaps this is one of the many queſtions in theology, that are unneceſſary or improper. It is ſufficient to ſay that it appears either to have been neceſſary or beſt, that one truly divine ſhould make ſatisfaction for ſin, ſince it has been ordained of God, who does nothing unneceſſary.

But beſides this, it ſeems to be conſonant to other parts of revealed religion, particularly the infinite evil of ſin as committed againſt God, for which no finite being ſeems ſufficient to atone. To which we may add, that all finite, dependant, created beings are under ſuch obligations themſelves, that it is not eaſy to ſee what they can do in obedience to the will of God, which can have any merit in it, or which they would not be obliged to do for the purpoſe

of his glory at any time ; neither does any created being ſeem ſo much his own maſter, as to enter into any ſuch undertaking.

There is an objection made to this doctrine, ſometimes to the following purpoſe.—How could the ſecond perſon of the ever bleſſed Trinity be ſaid to make ſatisfaction? Was he not equally offended with the other? Could he make ſatisfaction to himſelf? But this objection is eaſily ſolved, for not to mention that we cannot transfer with ſafety every thing human to God, the thing in queſtion is by no means unknown in human affairs. Though for the payment of a debt on which the creditor inſiſts, it would be ridiculous to ſay he might pay himſelf; yet in the character of a magiſtrate ſitting to judge a criminal where he repreſents the public, it is no way unſuitable for him to put off the public perſon, and ſatisfy the demands of juſtice, and preſerve the honor of the law.

Here I would conclude by juſt obſerving, that there is no neceſſity of a ſurety's doing juſt the ſame thing in kind that the guilty perſon was bound to do. The character and dignity of the ſurety may operate ſo far as to produce the legal effect, and make the ſatisfaction proper for giving its due honour to the law. Thus in the ſufferings of Chriſt, the infinite value of the ſufferer's perſon, makes the ſufferings to be conſidered as a juſt equivalent to the eternal ſufferings of a finite creature.

LECTURE XVII.

LET us proceed to the conſtitution of the covenant; and you may obſerve that there is ſome difference among orthodox divines as to the way of ſtating the parties and the terms of the covenant of grace. There ſeems to be mention made in ſcripture of a covenant or agreement between the Father and the Son. This the ge-

nerality of Calviniſt divines conſider as a ſeparate or preparatory contract, and call it the covenant of redemption. Some however, eſpecially thoſe who have been termed Antinomians, conſider this as properly the covenant of grace, made with Chriſt the ſecond Adam as repreſenting his ſpiritual ſeed, and the covenant ſaid to be made with believers to be only the execution or adminiſtration of that covenant, and therefore called a teſtament, being the fruits of Chriſt's death, or ratified by the death of the teſtator. According to the different ways of viewing this matter, they expreſs themſelves differently. The firſt ſaying that the condition of the covenant of grace is faith in Jeſus Chriſt; and the other ſaying it is the righteouſneſs of Chriſt. I do not apprehend there need be any difference between thoſe now mentioned, and I obſerve Mr. Williſon in his catechiſm takes it both ways. I ſhall firſt very ſhortly ſhew you from ſcripture that there is plainly mention made of a covenant, or a tranſaction between the Father and the Son, which, if diſtinct from the covenant of grace, may be properly enough called the covenant of redemption.

There are many promiſes made directly to the mediator reſpecting this matter, Pſ. ii. 6. "I declare the de-"cree," &c. Iſa. v. 3, 10. "When he ſhall make his "ſoul," &c. Iſa. xlii. 1, 6, 7. "Behold my ſervant whom "I uphold; mine elect in whom my ſoul delighteth, I "have put my ſpirit upon him, he ſhall bring forth judg-"ment to the Gentiles. I the Lord have called thee in "righteouſneſs and will hold thine hand, and will keep "thee and give thee for a covenant of the people, for a light "of the Gentiles, Zech. vi. 13. "And the council of peace "ſhall be between them both." I only further mention Pſ. xl. 6, 7, 8, "Sacrifice and offering thou didſt not "deſire," &c. The truth is, that not only the Socinians who are enemies to the ſatisfaction of Chriſt, but even the Arminians decline the admiſſion of this truth, and attempt to explain away the above texts; yet ſomething equivalent to it is neceſſarily conſequent upon Chriſt's undertaking. When he was conſtituted mediator by the Divine decree, he muſt have aſſented to it, and freely undertaken the im-

portant charge. It is alſo evidently the ſpirit of the New Teſtament diſpenſation that the hope and ſtrength of believers are in Chriſt. He is ſaid to have aſcended up on high and received gifts for men, and of his fulneſs, we are ſaid by the apoſtle John, to receive grace for grace.

But the covenant of grace is ſaid to be more frequently made with men, with the houſe of Iſrael, with the choſen of God, with his people. It is a compact or agreement between God and elect ſinners to give freely and of mere mercy Chriſt to die for them, and with him a pardon of ſin and a right to everlaſting life, together with the Spirit of ſanctification to make them meet for it; all which the believer receives and accepts in the manner in which it is offered and reſts his eternal ſtate upon it. This tranſaction has many different titles given it in ſcripture. It is called the *covenant of grace*, which is properly the Theological phraſe—*a covenant*, becauſe it is often called ſo in the Old Teſtament and in the New, and *of grace* becauſe it is ſo often repeated in both that ſalvation is of grace, and particularly in order to ſtate the oppoſition between it and the covenant of works. It is alſo called a covenant of peace, and that with a double view; to diſtinguiſh it from the covenant of works, and from the covenant on Sinai at the giving the law. It is called likewiſe an everlaſting covenant, to diſtinguiſh it from any temporary covenant—It is alſo called the *promise*, and the promiſe made of GOD unto our fathers.

In what I ſhall further offer upon it, it is my deſign (1.) To conſider the conſtitution of the covenant in its promiſes and conditions. (2.) The various diſpenſations of it and their relations to one another. (3.) In what manner the goſpel is to be preached agreeably to it, and what views of things are contrary to it.

As to the conſtitution of the covenant, you ſee the firſt and leading idea of it is, free and unmerited mercy—that ſinners had deſerved to periſh—that divine juſtice pronounced their condemnation. This muſt lie at the foundation of the whole.—It was for this reaſon that a mediator was provided, and the Saviour is offered by God himſelf, as the fruit of his love, John iii. 16. "God ſo loved

" the world," &c. The freeneſs of ſalvation in the goſpel is largely inſiſted on, and proved by the apoſtle in his epiſtle to the Romans, and particularly chap. iv. 16. ſpeaking of the covenant under the title of the law of faith, he ſays, " therefore it is of faith, that it might be of grace." This covenant is eſtabliſhed by a mediator, for every bleſſing comes to believers through Chriſt and for his ſake, who is made unto us wiſdom and righteouſneſs, ſanctification and redemption. The promiſes of the covenant of grace, may be taken in either view, more generally or more particularly.—In general, it procures deliverance from the wrath of God, and from every part of the curſe of a broken law. Some alſo diſtinguiſh the promiſes generally, into grace and glory,—peace with God, holineſs on earth, and the enjoyment of God at laſt. But that I may ſtate them in the way moſt proper for preaching the goſpel and carrying the meſſage of peace, I ſhall enumerate them in the following order:—

(1) The covenant promiſes Chriſt the mediator to make ſatisfaction to divine juſtice by his ſufferings and death. He was the promiſe made of God unto the fathers, and under the obſcurity of the ancient diſpenſation he was the hope of Iſrael, and the deſire of all nations; and when he was come into the world, he was called the Lord's Chriſt, and the ſalvation of God. So Simeon expreſſed himſelf, " Lord now letteſt thou thy ſervant depart in peace," &c. And as the Redeemer appeared firſt as the object of faith to the ancient patriarchs, ſo to convinced ſinners under the goſpel, a ſaviour is the firſt ground of conſolation.

(2) The covenant promiſes the full and free pardon of all ſin through Chriſt, John i. 16. Iſa. lv. 1. The forgiveneſs of ſins is the doctrine which Chriſt commanded his diſciples to preach to all nations, beginning at Jeruſalem, 1 Tim. i. 15. " This is a faithful ſaying," &c. The univerſality of the offer of mercy, is what particularly diſtinguiſhes it, Matth. xi. 28. " Come unto me—and him that " cometh, I will in no wiſe caſt out." &c. This ſeems to be indeed the preliminary mercy, that opens the way to every other, and it was in this view that the goſpel was

preached to the humbled and needy, Luke iv. 18. "The "spirit of the Lord is upon me," &c.

(3.) The covenant promises the spirit of sanctification to renew our nature, and form us for the service of God, Jer. xxxi. 33, 34. Jer. xxxii. 40. "And I will make an "everlasting covenant with them," &c. Ezek. xxxvi. 25, 26, 27. "Then will I sprinkle clean water upon you," &c. It is with a view to this, that we are told, Acts v. 31, "That Christ was exalted," &c. I need not multiply passages to this purpose, for it is the constant testimony of the scriptures, that any gracious disposition in believers is the work of God's holy Spirit, and therefore are they called the fruit of the Spirit. It is not only the bringing sinners again to God by repentance that is considered as the work of God's Spirit, but the continuance and increase of sanctification is attributed to their being an habitation of God through the Spirit; "I will live in them and walk "in them," &c.

(4.) The covenant promises the favor of God, and all its happy fruits, while in this life, 2 Cor. xvii. 18. "Where- "fore come out from among them, and be ye separate, "saith the Lord," &c. I need not here mention the particulars that fall under this head—deliverance from temptations—support under sufferings—the sanctified use of sufferings; because we are in one word assured that "all things shall work together for good to them that love God," and 1 Cor. iii. 22. "For all things are yours, whether Paul or Apollos," &c.

(5.) In the last place, the covenant promises eternal life. We cannot say what would have been the fullness of that life which belonged to the first covenant; but it seems to be generally agreed, that the promise of a glorious immortality, contained in the gospel, is much greater and more valuable, than that which was lost by the fall. Life and immortality are said to be brought to light by the gospel; and our Saviour is said to have entered into the holiest of all, as the first fruits of them that slept, and to have gone to prepare a place for them, that where he is, there they may be also.

Let us now ſpeak of the conditions of the covenant of grace. As I hinted before, thoſe who make the covenant of grace and covenant of redemption the ſame thing, ſay, the condition is Chriſt's perfect merit and obedience. Neither indeed is there any thing elſe that can be called the meritorious condition. Thoſe who ſay that the covenant of grace was made with man, ſay that the conditions is faith in our Lord Jeſus Chriſt. And it is undoubtedly true, that faith intereſts us in Chriſt, and brings us really within the bond of the covenant. Faith alone brings us to it; for any thing elſe that might be conſidered as a condition, is only a promiſe of what God will do for his people. But to ſtate this matter as clearly as I am able, whether there are conditions or not, or what are the conditions of the covenant of grace, depends entirely on the ſenſe in which we take the word condition. If we take it as implying proper merit, or the plea or claim in juſtice for obtaining the promiſes, nothing can be plainer, than that there is not, and cannot be of this kind, any condition, but the voluntary, perfect, meritorious obedience of the Lord Jeſus Chriſt. If we take it as ſignifying any particular duty or performance, as the term on which the promiſe is ſuſpended, as in the firſt covenant abſtaining from the tree of knowledge of good and evil, it can ſcarcely be ſaid with propriety, that it has a condition; for the tenor of the covenant, in its promiſing part, is ſuch, that every thing of this kind is promiſed as the work of God. Therefore many divines have aſſerted, that the goſpel, ſtrictly ſo called, has no condition, but conſiſts wholly of free and gracious promiſes. (See this matter well ſtated in Witſius' Economy of the Covenants.) It is for this reaſon, that it is often called a teſtament, even where we have it tranſlated covenant.

But if condition is taken to ſignify a character, qualification, or what is neceſſary to fit us for everlaſting life, then faith, repentance, new obedience, and final perſeverance, are all conditions, but very improperly ſo called. Indeed in this ſenſe the covenant of grace has as many conditions as the law has duties. Yet even in this view we are carefully to obſerve, that there is a difference in the conſtitution of the covenant of grace, between faith

in the blood of the atonement, and its fruits, the various graces of the chriſtian life. For as the promiſes of the covenant contain not only the free pardon of ſin for Chriſt's ſake, but alſo the ſpirit of ſanctification, faith is the immediate inſtrument for receiving or laying hold of this mercy. If there is to man (properly ſpeaking) a condition of the covenant, it muſt be faith, becauſe this, renouncing all ſelf-dependance, accepts and cloſes with the promiſe of recovery and ſalvation, juſt in the manner in which it is offered freely, without money and without price. It is plainly ſtated in this manner in the Epiſtle to the Romans. "Therefore it is by faith, that it may be by grace." "To him that worketh is the reward not "reckoned of grace, but of debt; but to him that worketh "not, but believeth in him that juſtifieth the ungodly, his "faith is counted to him for righteouſneſs." Faith indeed is highly proper for receiving the righteouſneſs of Chriſt, becauſe it gives the glory only to God. To ſuppoſe faith has any merit in it is juſt as abſurd as to ſuppoſe that a perſon, being wholly needy and helpleſs, his accepting the bounty of another, is an evidence of his having abundance of his own.

As to the fruits of faith, or works of righteouſneſs, no perſon can deny that they are the proper evidence of our relation to God:—That they are the expreſſions of our love to him:—That they are neceſſary to form us for his ſervice and fit us for his preſence: But being the work of his holy Spirit, and the accompliſhment of his faithful promiſe, it is impoſſible that they ſhould be in any reſpect conditions of the covenant of grace.

The promiſes of the covenant of grace are ranged in a certain order—they introduce and lead to one another, and they are to be received and applied preciſely in the ſame order—Chriſt the Saviour—the free pardon of ſin—a new nature as the work of his ſpirit—increaſe of grace—a ſanctified Providence—victory over death—and the poſſeſſion of everlaſting life.—Theſe muſt take place juſt in the order I have mentioned them. If the order is inverted, the ſyſtem is deſtroyed.

2. The second thing to be considered is the various dispensations of the covenant, and their relation to one another. The covenant of grace in every dispensation differs from the covenant of works. The covenant of works required perfect obedience, and one sin rendered it void. In the covenant of grace there is provision made, not only for reconciling the sinner, but for daily pardon to the believer. In the covenant of works every thing depends upon the personal conduct of the interested party; in the covenant of grace there is a Mediator who lays his hands upon them both.

As to the dispensations of the covenant of grace we may consider them as appearing before the law, under the law, and from the coming of Christ.

(1.) Before giving the law we see the promise is made in the following terms—"The seed of the woman shall "bruise the serpant's head,"—And to Abraham—"In thy "seed shall all the nations of the earth be blessed." I think the promise, if not the covenant, was substantially made the same then as now. The apostle to the Galatians, iii. 17, thought the same thing, that the promise to Abraham was the New Testament promise, and that whatever the law had peculiar to itself was posterior to the promise, "and "this I say that the covenant which was confirmed before "of God in Christ," &c. The promise at that time, as now, was eternal life, as the Apostle to the Hebrews plainly proves, Heb. xi. 13. "These all died in faith," &c.—It is also plain I think, that as the promise to the faith of the ancient patriarchs was in substance the same with ours, so their faith itself was also the same. It was a reliance on the mercy of God. It was that faith which is the evidence of things not seen, and the substance of things hoped for.

(2.) Under the law the covenant also was the same in substance, as appears by the arguments just now hinted at. The only thing particular, is to consider what was the import of the Sinai covenant, or the design of giving the law of Moses. Some, seeing that the Levitical law consists chiefly of temporal promises, are for supposing that

diſpenſation quite diſtinct from the covenant of grace. They have even called the ten commandments given upon Mount Sinai, a republication of the law of nature, and of the covenant of works. A late celebrated writer, Dr. Warburton, attempted to ſhew that Moſes did not in the law give them any reaſon to expect eternal life, but confined both the promiſes and threatenings entirely to things temporal. Even to this author probably many have imputed more than he intended to affirm. Yet he certainly carries his arguments too far, in ſuppoſing that in none of the inſpired writers of the Old Teſtament is eternal life propoſed as the object of faith. This may be eaſily refuted; and indeed is in the book of Job ſo ſtrongly refuted, that the author is forced into the extraordinary ſuppoſition of that book being as late as the Babyloniſh captivity, in order to rid himſelf of it. However, I think that it muſt be admitted that temporal promiſes and threatnings make the moſt diſtinguiſhed appearance in the Levitical law. This took place becauſe it was deſigned as a typical diſpenſation, and to be a ſhadow of good things to come. It is plain however, that the law of Moſes did not provide an atonement for every crime, and ſuppoſed many ſins which could not be expiated by the blood of bulls or of goats, for which the only remedy was reliance on the mere mercy of God, in the exerciſe of true repentance, ſee Iſa. i. 16. &c. the ſame prophet, chap. lv. 1. "Ho! every one that thirſteth," &c.

The New Teſtament expreſsly tells us, that the law was a ſchool-maſter to bring us to Chriſt, and the innumerable perſons, and things, and ordinances, that were typical in it, need not be mentioned. The land of Canaan itſelf, and all the temporal promiſes preparatory to it or in conſequence of the poſſeſſion of it, had a reference to the ſpiritual promiſes under the goſpel, and doubtleſs the acceptance and ſalvation of them under the law, are upon the footing of the everlaſting covenant, which began to be delivered before the law was given, and will continue till the final conſummation of all things.

The moral law publiſhed upon Mount Sinai muſt not be conſidered as a republication of the covenant of works,

but a publication or ſummary of that immutable law of righteouſneſs, which is the duty of creatures, and muſt accompany the adminiſtration of every covenant which God makes with man.

(3.) Since the coming of Chriſt, the covenant of grace is adminiſtered in a manner more full, clear and efficacious than in any of the former ſtates. It was formerly adminiſtered in the name of, and by a promiſed Saviour; It is now adminiſtered in the name of, and by a riſen Redeemer, who once ſuffered and now reigns in glory. The harmony of all the divine perfections in the great ſalvation, is more apparent now than formerly, and the preaching of the glad tidings of peace to ſinners is more explicit and more univerſal. What falls chiefly to be conſidered is, how far the former diſpenſations are ſuſpended or abrogated by the coming of Chriſt in the fleſh. The covenant ratified by the death of Chriſt is called a new covenant, in oppoſition to that which is old and vaniſhed away. Certainly the covenant is called new, in oppoſition to the covenant of works, which as the way of ſalvation was abrogated from the date of the firſt promiſe, and both in the Epiſtles to the Romans, Galatians and Hebrews, eſpecially the two former, the goſpel or law of grace, is oppoſed to the law of works, meaning the firſt covenant. And that I may ſatisfy you of this without entering into the endleſs criticiſms upon particular paſſages, obſerve that thoſe who would by the law, underſtand the law of Moſes, excluſive of the covenant of works, may be eaſily confuted, for the Apoſtle ſays, "that it is by faith, that it may be by grace." —That if juſtification was by works, Abraham might have whereof to glory; and that the deſign of this conſtitution was that no fleſh might glory in God's preſence. The ceremonial law is undoubtedly abrogated both from the expreſs declaration of ſcripture, and from the nature and reaſon of things—Chriſt is now the end of the law for righteouſneſs to every one that believeth. And as the whole ſyſtem of the Moſaic law was intended to typify the goſpel diſpenſation when Chriſt was actually come in the fleſh, it muſt fall of itſelf as unneceſſary or hurtful.

There has been much controverſy whether it was proper to ſay that the moral law was abrogated, or to apply to that law what is ſaid of believers not being under the law but under grace. This matter, one would think, might be eaſily reconciled, for doubtleſs the moral law as a covenant of works, carrying a ſentence of condemnation againſt every tranſgreſſion, is abrogated. But the moral law as the unalterable rule of duty to creatures is antecedent to all covenants, and cannot be affected by them. The moral law as it requires obedience to the will, and conformity to the nature of God, was binding on the Angels before the creation of the world; and will be the duty of holy angels and redeemed ſinners after the reſurrection. But there is alſo another view of this ſubject—that the moral law is a part of the covenant of grace, in the hand of the Mediator. It is the promiſe of the covenant that the law ſhall be written in our hearts, an unfeigned faith implies the acceptance of this as well as other promiſes, ſo that the believer not only remains under his original unchangeable obligation to keep the law, but comes under a new and peculiar obligation which is to be diſcharged in his Redeemer's ſtrength: ſo that to take the thing properly, there is more obedience in the covenant of grace, than in the covenant of works. The covenant of grace requires unfeigned ſubjection to every part of the ſame law, with this mortifying addition, that the believer receives it wholly as a condition of his acceptance, and aſcribes it entirely to the riches of divine grace.

There is ſometimes mention made of the political law of Moſes, and it is demanded whether this is of pepetual obligation? The anſwer ſeems to be eaſy. It contains an excellent ſyſtem of laws ſuited to the ſettlement of the Jews in Canaan, and many principles of equity, that may be of great uſe to other legiſlators; but as the civil laws in general have only in view temporal property and convenience, they certainly are not unalterable, becauſe they muſt be ſuited to the ſtate of ſociety—and other circumſtances which may be very various.—Sundry of the precepts alſo in the political law ſeem to have an allegorical meaning, and to have been made either with a

view of ſuggeſting or ſtrengthening moral principles, or to be typical of goſpel times—as the precept, thou ſhalt "not muzzle the ox that treadeth out the corn," "thou "ſhalt not ſeethe the kid in its mother's milk."—But we may obſerve that the principles laid down in the criminal law are founded upon ſo much wiſdom, that it is a queſtion whether the departure from them in puniſhing of crimes has ever been attended with advantage. As for example, in regard to violence—the law of retaliation—an eye for an eye and a tooth for a tooth—in theft and fraud—reſtitution—and the puniſhment of adultery with death.

What remains upon this ſubject is only to point out in what manner the goſpel is to be preached agreeably to it, and what views of things are contrary to it. To ſet this matter before you with as much diſtinctneſs and propriety as I am able, obſerve, that this gracious diſpenſation muſt be opened and preſſed juſt as it is ſuited to the various conditions of thoſe to whom it is addreſſed—theſe I ſhall divide into three great claſſes. (1.) Secure or ſelf-righteous perſons. (2.) Convinced ſinners. (3.) Profeſſing believers.

1. Secure or ſelf-righteous perſons, who do not ſeem to have ever laid their eternal concerns to heart, or are building on ſome falſe foundation, as a form of godlineſs, or the merit of good works, or the comparative ſmallneſs of the ſins of which they are guilty. To theſe it is neceſſary to preach the law in all its extent, and in all the force of its obligation. It is neceſſary to point out the evil of ſin, the loſt ſtate of man by nature; and the abſolute neceſſity of pardon through the blood of Chriſt and renovation by his ſpirit. It may be very proper for them and all others, to ſhew them the guilt and folly of particular ſins, ſuch as ſwearing, drunkenneſs, uncleanneſs. But if ſomething more is not done, the evil is not ſearched to the bottom, for we ought to ſhew them that theſe are but the fruits of an unrenewed nature.—That reſtraining, moderating, or even reforming a particular ſin is not enough, nor any evidence of a change from ſin unto God. It is particularly proper in ſuch caſes to point out the extent and ſpirituality of the law, as reaching to the

thoughts of the heart, so as if possible to shew them that they are guilty and helpless, and that there is no salvation in any but in Christ. This leads us to say,

2. That with regard to convinced sinners, it is very particularly necessary to set before them the all-sufficiency of Christ, the fulness and freeness of that salvation which he purchased upon the cross, and offers in his word. To shew them that he has finished his work, and done every thing necessary to render it perfectly consistent with the justice and holiness of God to forgive even the chief of sinners. But this will be best illustrated by pointing out some sentiments and views contrary to the freeness of salvation, and the plan of the gospel.

(1) It is contrary to the freeness of salvation and to the covenant of grace to extenuate sin, to have hard thoughts of God, of the strictness of his law, or the severity of its sanction. This arises from imperfect conviction of sin which sometimes makes the sinner use some efforts to obtain salvation; but still he is apt to think he would have very hard measures if he was rejected. Imperfect convictions lead sinners to seek their comfort from the extenuation of sin, but true faith incites the sinner to give full force to the accusation, and to plead the benefit of the remission.

(2) It is contrary to the freeness of salvation and to the tenor of the covenant of grace, to think that the greatness or atrociousness of sin should hinder our returning to God for obtaining mercy. This is one of the first reflections of a sinner under conviction, that he has sinned more than any other, and that another can sooner expect forgiveness than he. While this only serves to increase humiliation, and rase to the foundation every degree of self-confidence, its operation is salutary. But sometimes this arises from too rooted an adherence to some degree of human merit as necessary to find favor with God, and then instead of compelling the sinner to rest in the infinite compassion of God, it makes him fall upon some scheme of purchasing salvation for himself; or if he finds this impracticable, perhaps he is plunged into the gulph of despair. In opposition to this, the new and well ordered covenant sends him

to the infinite fulneſs of Chriſt for a free and complete pardon, and for deliverance from the power of his corruptions.

3. It is contrary to the freeneſs of ſalvation and the covenant of grace, to have any dependence on one's being comparatively leſs wicked than another. If the ſinner's hope ariſes much from his having been free from this or that ſin, he is reſting on a legal foundation. This was a rock of perdition to the Phariſees—See how the Saviour has oppoſed this character to the other, Luke xviii. 11. "The Phariſees ſtood and prayed," &c. Not that God would repreſent it as a leſs ſafe ſtate to attend to the exerciſe of religion than to be an adulterer. But when men reſt their dependance on their comparative goodneſs in themſelves, it only ſerves to lead them away from an eſteem and acceptance of divine mercy. On this account our Saviour ſays to the Phariſees, Matth. xxi. 31. "Verily I ſay unto you, the Publicans," &c. The ſight of a great profligate deadens the ſenſe of ſin in the minds of many worldly perſons, but in an humble penitent it only excites him to reflect upon the great principles of all ſin in his own heart, and what he might have been, had not a reſtraining Providence and recovering grace been his preſervation.

4. It is contrary to the freeneſs of ſalvation and the covenant of grace, to ſuppoſe that we may not, or muſt not, lay hold of divine mercy till we have done ſomething ourſelves in the way of duty and performance; till our penitential tears or purpoſes of obedience, or begun reformation, entitle us to call it ours. No doubt ſelf-denial and experience of the treachery of our own hearts ſhould fill us with humility and jealouſy of ourſelves; but the true way to reconcile the heart to duty, and to break the power of ſin is to reſt our hope upon Divine Mercy for pardon, and on the promiſe in the covenant of the Holy Spirit to ſanctify us wholly. Many retard their reformation as well as obſtruct their comfort by yielding to a ſpirit of bondage and ſlaviſh fear. We ſhould rather pray in the words of Zechariah, Luke i. 74. "That we being delivered," &c.

5. It is contrary to the freeneſs of ſalvation and the covenant of grace to boaſt of our own righteouſneſs, or in any degree to truſt in our own ſtrength. The motto of a Chriſtian ſhould be in the words of the Prophet Iſa. xlv. 24. "Surely ſhall one ſay," &c. It is not merely the pardon of ſin, but the ſanctification of the nature and ſtrength for daily obedience that is promiſed in the covenant; and both muſt be received from the Mediator's hand and aſcribed to him as their proper ſource. It is an admirable expreſſion of the Apoſtle Paul, who ſays, "I "obtained mercy to be faithful," accounting that a ſubject of gratitude and a mercy received, which others would have reckoned an occaſion of boaſting. Nothing is more contrary to the ſpirit of the goſpel than ſelf dependance, and indeed the whole ſubſtance of this diſpenſation has been deſigned to abaſe the pride of man, and to exalt the grace of God.

To profeſſing believers, the whole duties of the law of God are to be preached, for believers are not without law to God, but under the law to Chriſt. The laws of the goſpel are to be inculcated as the fruits of faith, and the evidence of a ſaving change. There is a great difference between conſidering duties as going before, and as following faith and reconciliation; the firſt is legal, the laſt evangelical. You need not be afraid but that duties may be preached as ſtrictly in the laſt way as in the firſt, and it will certainly be done with much greater ſafety.

LETTERS

ON

EDUCATION.

LETTER I.

AFTER so long a delay, I now set myself to fulfil my promise of writing to you a few thoughts on the education of children.—Though I cannot wholly purge myself of the crimes of laziness and procrastination, yet I do assure you, what contributed not a little to its being hitherto not done, was, that I considered it not as an ordinary letter, but what deserved to be carefully meditated on, and thoroughly digested. The concern you show on this subject, is highly commendable: for there is no part of your duty, as a Christian, or a citizen, which will be of greater service to the public, or a source of greater comfort to yourself.

The consequence of my thinking so long upon it, before committing my thoughts to paper, will probably be the taking the thing in a greater compass than either of us at first intended, and writing a series of letters, instead of one. With this view I begin with a preliminary to the successful education of children, viz. that husband and wife ought to be entirely one upon this subject, not only agreed as to

the end, but as to the means to be uſed, and the plan to be followed, in order to attain it. It ought to encourage you to proceed in your deſign, that I am perſuaded you will not only meet with no oppoſition to a rational and ſerious education of your children, but great aſſiſtance from Mrs. S——— * * * * * * * * * *

The eraſed lines contained a compliment, written with great ſincerity: but recollecting that there are no rules yet ſettled for diſtinguiſhing true compliment from flattery, I have blotted them out: on which, perhaps, you will ſay to yourſelf, "he is fulfilling the character which his "enemies give him, who ſay, it is the nature of the man "to deal much more in ſatire, than in panegyric." However, I content myſelf with repeating, that certainly huſband and wife ought to conſpire and co operate in every thing relating to the education of their children; and if their opinions happen, in any particular, to be different, they ought to examine and ſettle the matter privately by themſelves, that not the leaſt oppoſition may appear either to children or ſervants. When this is the caſe, every thing is enforced by a double authority, and recommended by a double example: but when it is otherwiſe, the pains taken are commonly more than loſt, not being able to do any good, and certainly producing very much evil.

Be pleaſed to remember, that this is by no means intended againſt thoſe unhappy couples, who, being eſſentially different in principles and character, live in a ſtate of continual war. It is of little advantage to ſpeak either to, or of ſuch perſons. But even differences incomparably ſmaller, are of very bad conſequence: when one, for example, thinks a child may be carried out, and the other thinks it is wrong; when one thinks a way of ſpeaking is dangerous, and the other is poſitive there is nothing in it. The things themſelves may indeed be of little moment; but the want of concurrence in the parents, or the want of mutual eſteem and deference, eaſily obſerved even by very young children, is of the greateſt importance.

As you and I have chiefly in view the religious education of children, I take it to be an excellent preliminary that parental affection ſhould be purified by the principles

and controled or directed by the precepts of religion. A parent ſhould rejoice in his children, as they are the gift of a gracious God; ſhould put his truſt in the care of an indulgent Providence for the preſervation of his offspring, as well as himſelf; ſhould be ſupremely deſirous that they may be, in due time, the heirs of eternal life; and, as he knows the abſolute dependance of every creature upon the will of God, ſhould be ready to reſign them at what time his Creator ſhall ſee proper to demand them. This happy qualification of parental tenderneſs, will have a powerful influence in preventing miſtakes in the conduct of education. It will be the moſt powerful of all incitements to duty and at the ſame time a reſtraint upon that natural fondneſs and indulgence, which, by a ſort of faſcination of fatality, makes parents often do or permit what their judgment condemns, and then excuſe themſelves by ſaying that no doubt it is wrong, but truly they cannot help it.

Another preliminary to the proper education of children, is a firm perſuaſion of the benefit of it, and the probable, at leaſt, if not certain ſucceſs of it, when faithfully and prudently conducted. This puts an edge upon the ſpirit, and enables the chriſtian not only to make ſome attempts, but to perſevere with patience and diligence. I know not a common ſaying either more falſe or pernicious, than "that the children of good men are as bad as others." This ſaying carries in it a ſuppoſition, that wheras the force of education is confeſſed with reſpect to every other human character and accompliſhment, it is of no conſequence at all as to religion. This, I think, is contrary to daily experience. Where do we expect to find young perſons piouſly diſpoſed but in pious families? the exceptions, or rather appearances to the contrary, are eaſily accounted for, in more ways than one. Many perſons appear to be religious, while they are not ſo in reality, but are chiefly governed by the applauſe of men. Hence their viſible conduct may be ſpecious, or their public performances applauded, and yet their families be neglected.

It muſt alſo be acknowledged that ſome truly well diſpoſed perſons are extremely defective or imprudent in this part of their duty, and therefore it is no wonder that it ſhould not ſucceed. This was plainly the caſe with

Eli, whoſe ſons we are told, made themſelves vile, and he reſtrained them not. However, I muſt obſerve, if we allow ſuch to be truly good men, we muſt at the ſame time confeſs that this was a great drawback upon their character; and that they differed very much from the father of the faithful, who had this honorable teſtimony given him by God, I know him, that he will command his children and his houſhold after him, that they ſerve me. To this we may add, that the child of a good man, who is ſeen to follow diſſolute courſes, draws the attention of mankind more upon him, and is much more talked of, than any other perſon of the ſame character. Upon the whole, it is certainly of moment, that one who deſires to educate his children in the fear of God, ſhould do it in a humble perſuaſion, that if he was not defective in his own duty, he will not be denied the bleſſing of ſucceſs. I could tell you ſome remarkable inſtances of parents who ſeemed to labor in vain for a long time, and yet were ſo happy as to ſee a change at laſt; and of ſome children in whom even after the death of the parents, the ſeed which was early ſown, and ſeemed to have been entirely ſmothered, has at laſt produced fruit. And indeed no leſs ſeems to follow from the promiſe, annexed to the command, train up a child in the way he ſhould go, and when he is old he will not depart from it.

Having laid down theſe preliminaries, I ſhall ſay a few things upon the preſervation of the health of children. Perhaps you will think this belongs only to the phyſician: but though a phyſician ought to be employed to apply remedies in dangerous caſes, any man, with a little reflection, may be allowed to form ſome judgment as to the ordinary means of their preſervation; nay, I cannot help being of opinion, than any other man is fitter than a phyſician for this purpoſe. His thoughts are ſo conſtantly taken up with the rules of his art, that it is an hundred to one he will preſcribe more methods and medicines than can be uſed with ſafety.

The fundamental rules for preſerving the health of children, are cleanlineſs, liberty, and free air. By cleanlineſs, I do not mean keeping the outſide of their clothes

in a proper condition to be seen before company, nor hindering them from fouling their hands and feet, when they are capable of going abroad, but keeping them dry in the night time, when young, and frequently washing their bodies with cold water, and other things of the same nature and tendency. The second rule is liberty. All persons young and old, love liberty: and as far as it does them no harm, it will certainly do them good. Many a free born subject is kept a slave for the first ten years of his life; and is so much handled and carried about by women in his infancy, that the limbs and other parts of his body, are frequently misshapen, and the whole very much weakened; besides, the spirits, when under confinement, are generally in a dull and languishing state. The best exercise in the world for children, is to let them romp and jump about as soon as they are able, according to their own fancy. This in the country is best done in the fields; in a city a well aired room is better than being sent into the streets under the care of a servant, very few of whom are able so far to curb their own inclinations, as to let the children follow theirs, even where they may do it with safety. As to free air, there is nothing more essentially necessary to the strength and growth of animals and plants. If a few plants of any kind are sown in a close confined place, they commonly grow up tall, small, and very weak. I have seen a bed of beans in a garden, under the shade of a hedge or tree, very long and slender, which brought to my mind a young family of quality, trained up in a delicate manner, who if they grow at all, grow to length, but never to thickness. So universal is this, that I believe the body of a sturdy or well built make, is reckoned among them a coarse and vulgar thing.

There is one thing with regard to servants, that I would particularly recommend to your attention. All children are liable to accidents; these may happen unavoidably; but do generally arise from the carelessness of servants, and to this they are almost always attributed by parents. This disposes all servants, good or bad, to conceal them from the parents, when they can possibly do it. By this means

children often receive hurts in falls or otherwise, which if known in time, might be easily remedied, but not being known either prove fatal, or make them lame or deformed. A near relation of mine has a high shoulder and a distorted waist, from this very cause. To prevent such accidents, it is necessary to take all pains possible to acquire the confidence of servants, to convince them of the necessity of concealing nothing. There are two dispositions in parents, which hinder the servants from making discoveries; the first is when they are very passionate, and apt to storm and rage against their servants, for every real or supposed neglect. Such persons can never expect a confession, which must be followed by such terrible vengeance. The other is, when they are tender-hearted or timorous to excess, which makes them show themselves deeply affected or greatly terrified upon any little accident that befals their children. In this case, the very best servants are unwilling to tell them through fear of making them miserable. In such cases, therefore, I would advise parents, whatever may be their real opinions, to discover them as little as possible to their servants. Let them still inculcate this maxim, that there should be no secrets concerning children, kept from those most nearly interested in them. And that there may be no temptation to such conduct, let them always appear as cool and composed as possible, when any discovery is made, and be ready to forgive a real fault, in return for a candid acknowledgment.

LETTER II.

IF I mistake not, my last letter was concluded by some remarks on the means of trying servants to be careful of the safety of children, and ready to discover early and honestly any accidents that might happen to befal them. I must make some farther remarks upon servants. It is a subject of great importance, and inseparably connected with what I have undertaken. You will find it extremely

difficult to educate children properly, if the ſervants of the family do not conſpire in it; and impoſſible, if they are inclined to hinder it. In ſuch a caſe, the orders iſſued, or the method laid down, will be neglected, where that is poſſible and ſafe; where neglect is unſafe, they will be unſucceſsfully or improperly executed, and many times, in the hearing of the children, they will be either laughed at, or complained of and diſapproved. The certain conſequence of this is, that children will inſenſibly come to look upon the directions and cautions of their parents, as unneceſſary or unreaſonable reſtraints. It is a known and very common way for ſervants, to inſinuate themſelves into the affections of children, by granting them ſuch indulgences as would be refuſed them by their parents, as well as concealing the faults which ought to be puniſhed by parents, and they are often very ſucceſsful in training them up to a moſt dangerous fidelity in keeping the ſecret.

Such is the evil to be feared, which ought to have been more largely deſcribed: let us now come to the remedy. The foundation, to be ſure, is to be very nice and careful in the choice of ſervants. This is commonly thought to be an extremely difficult matter, and we read frequently in public papers the heavieſt complaints of bad ſervants. I am, however, one of thoſe who think the fault is at leaſt as often in the maſters. Good ſervants may certainly be had, and do generally incline of themſelves to be in good families, and when they find that they are ſo, do often continue very long in the ſame, without deſiring to remove. You ought, therefore, to be exceedingly ſcrupulous, and not without an evident neceſſity, to hire any ſervant but who ſeems to be ſober and pious. Indeed, I flatter myſelf, that a pious family is ſuch, as none but one who is either a ſaint or a hypocrite will be ſuppoſed to continue in. If any ſymptoms of the laſt character appears, you neen dot be told what you ought to do.

The next thing, after the choice of ſervants, is to make conſcience of doing your duty to them, by example, inſtruction, admonition and prayer. Your fidelity to them will naturally produce in them fidelity to you and yours,

and that upon the very beſt principles. It will excite in them a deep ſenſe of gratitude, and at the ſame time fill them with ſentiments of the higheſt and moſt unfeigned eſteem. I could tell you of inſtances (you will however probably recollect ſome yourſelf) of ſervants who from their living comfortably, and receiving benefits in pious families, have preſerved ſuch a regard and attachment to their maſters, as have been little ſhort of idolatry. I ſhall juſt mention one—a worthy woman in this place, formerly ſervant to one of my predeceſſors, and married many years ſince to a thriving tradeſman, continues to have ſuch an undiminiſhed regard to her maſter's memory, that ſhe cannot ſpeak of him without delight; keeps by her to this hour the newſpaper which gives an account of his death and character, and, I believe, would not exchange it for a bill or bond, for a very conſiderable ſum.

But the third and finiſhing direction with regard to ſervants, is to convince them, in a cool and diſpaſſionate manner, of the reaſonableneſs of your method of proceeding, that as it is dictated by conſcience, it is conducted with prudence. Thence it is eaſy to repreſent to them that it is their duty, inſtead of hindering its ſucceſs by oppoſition or negligence, to co-operate with it to the utmoſt of their power. It is not below any man to reaſon in ſome caſes with his ſervants. There is a way of ſpeaking to them on ſuch ſubjects, by which you will loſe nothing of your dignity, but even corroborate your authority. While you manifeſt your firm reſolution, never to depart from your right and title to command: you may, notwithſtanding, at proper ſeaſons, and by way of condeſcenſion, give ſuch general reaſons for your conduct, as to ſhow that you are not acting by mere caprice or humor. Nay, even while you ſometimes inſiſt, that your command of itſelf ſhall be a law, and that you will not ſuffer it to be diſputed, nor be obliged to give a reaſon for it, you may eaſily ſhow them that this alſo is reaſonable. They may be told that you have the greateſt intereſt in the welfare of your children, the beſt opportunity of being appriſed as to the means of proſecuting it, and that there

may be many reaſons for your orders, which it is unneceſſary or improper for them to know.

Do not think that all this is exceſſive refinement, chimerical or impoſſible. Servants are reaſonable creatures, and are beſt governed by a mixture of authority and reaſon. They are generally delighted to find themſelves treated as reaſonable, and will ſometimes diſcover a pride in ſhowing that they underſtand, as well as find a pleaſure in entering into your views. When they find, as they will every day by experience, the ſucceſs and benefit of a proper method of education, it will give them a high opinion of, and confidence in your judgment; they will frequently conſult you in their own affairs, as well as implicity follow your directions in the management of yours. After all, the very higheſt inſtance of true greatneſs of mind, and the beſt ſupport of your authority, when you ſee neceſſary to interpoſe it, is not to be opinionative or obſtinate, but willing to acknowledge or remit a real miſtake, if it is diſcreetly pointed out, even by thoſe in the loweſt ſtations. The application of theſe reflections will occur in ſeveral of the following branches of this ſubject.

The next thing I ſhall mention as neceſſary, in order to the education of children, is, to eſtabliſh as ſoon as poſſible, an entire and abſolute authority over them. This is a part of the ſubject which requires to be treated with great judgment and delicacy. I wiſh I may be able to do ſo. Opinions, like modes and faſhions, change continually upon every point; neither is it eaſy to keep the juſt middle, without verging to one or other of the extremes. On this, in particular, we have gone in this nation in general, from one extreme to the very utmoſt limits of the other. In the former age, both public and private, learned and religious education was carried on by mere dint of authority. This, to be ſure, was a ſavage and barbarous method, and was in many inſtances terrible and diſguſting to the youth. Now, on the other hand, not only ſeverity, but authority, is often decried; perſuaſion, and every ſoft and gentle method, is recommended, on ſuch terms as plainly lead to a relaxation. I hope you

will be convinced that the middle way is beſt, when you find it is recommended by the ſpirit of God in his word, Prov. xiii. 24. xix. 18. xxii. 15. You will alſo find a caution againſt exceſs in this matter, Col. ii. 21.

I have ſaid above, that you ſhould "eſtabliſh as ſoon as poſſible an entire and abſolute authority." I would have it early, that it may be abſolute, and abſolute that it may not be ſevere. If parents are too long in beginning to exert their authority, they will find the taſk very difficult. Children, habituated to indulgence for a few of their firſt years, are exceedingly impatient of reſtraint, and if they happen to be of ſtiff or obſtinate tempers, can hardly be brought to an entire, at leaſt to a quiet and placid ſubmiſſion; whereas, if they are taken in time, there is hardly any temper but what may be made to yield, and by early habit the ſubjection becomes quite eaſy to themſelves.

The authority ought alſo to be abſolute, that it may not be ſevere. The more complete and uniform a parent's authority is, the offences will be more rare, puniſhment will be leſs needed, and the more gentle kind of correction will be abundantly ſufficient. We ſee every where about us examples of this. A parent that has once obtained, and knows how to preſerve authority, will do more by a look of diſpleaſure, than another by the moſt paſſionate words and even blows. It holds univerſally in families and ſchools, and even the greater bodies of men, the army and navy, that thoſe who keep the ſtricteſt diſcipline, give the feweſt ſtrokes. I have frequently remarked that parents, even of the ſofteſt tempers, and who are famed for the greateſt indulgence to their children, do, notwithſtanding, correct them more frequently, and even more ſeverely, though to very little purpoſe, than thoſe who keep up their authority. The reaſon is plain. Children, by fooliſh indulgence, become often ſo froward and petulant in their tempers, that they provoke their eaſy parents paſt all endurance; ſo that they are obliged, if not to ſtrike, at leaſt to ſcold them, in a manner as little to their own credit, as their children's profit.

There is not a more diſguſting ſight than the impotent rage of a parent who has no authority. Among the lower ranks of people, who are under no reſtraint from decency, you may ſometimes ſee a father or mother running out into the ſtreet after a child who is fled from them, with looks of fury and words of execration; and they are often ſtupid enough to imagine that neighbors or paſſengers will approve them in this conduct, though in fact it fills every beholder with horror. There is a degree of the ſame fault to be ſeen in perſons of better rank, though expreſſing itſelf ſomewhat differently. Ill words and altercations will often fall out between parents and children before company; a ſure ſign that there is defect of government at home or in private. The parent ſtung with ſhame at the miſbehavior or indiſcretion of the child, deſires to perſuade the obſervers that it is not his fault, and thereby effectually convinces every perſon of reflection that it *is*.

I would therefore recommend to every parent to begin the eſtabliſhment of authority much more early than is commonly ſuppoſed to be poſſible: that is to ſay, from about the age of eight or nine months. You will perhaps ſmile at this: but I do aſſure you from experience, that by ſetting about it with prudence, deliberation, and attention, it may be in a manner completed by the age of twelve or fourteen months. Do not imagine I mean to bid you uſe the rod at that age; on the contrary, I mean to prevent the uſe of it in a great meaſure, and to point out a way by which children of ſweet and eaſy tempers may be brought to ſuch a habit of compliance, as never to need correction at all; and whatever their temper may be, ſo much leſs of this is ſufficient, than upon any other ſuppoſition. This is one of my favourite ſchemes; let me try to explain and recommend it.

Habits in general may be very early formed in children. An aſſociation of ideas is, as it were, the parent of habit. If then, you can accuſtom your children to perceive that your will muſt always prevail over theirs, when they are oppoſed, the thing is done, and they will ſubmit to it without difficulty or regret. To bring this about, as ſoon as they begin to ſhow their inclination by deſire or averſion, let ſingle inſtances be choſen now and then (not

too frequently) to contradict them. For example, if a child shows a desire to have any thing in his hand that he sees, or has any thing in his hand with which he is delighted, let the parent take it from him, and when he does so, let no consideration whatever make him restore it at that time. Then at a considerable interval, perhaps a whole day is little enough, especially at first, let the same thing be repeated. In the mean time, it must be carefully observed, that no attempt should be made to contradict the child in the intervals. Not the least appearance of opposition, if possible, should be found between the will of the parent and that of the child, except in those chosen cases when the parent must always prevail.

I think it necessary that those attempts should always be made and repeated at proper intervals by the same person. It is also better it should be by the father than the mother or any female attendant, because they will be necessarily obliged in many cases to do things displeasing to the child, as in dressing, washing, &c. which spoil the operation; neither is it necessary that they should interpose, for when once a full authority is established in one person, it can easily be communicated to others, as far as is proper. Remember, however, that mother or nurse should never presume to condole with the child, or show any signs of displeasure at his being crossed; but on the contrary, give every mark of approbation, and of their own submission, to the same person.

This experiment frequently repeated will in a little time so perfectly habituate the child to yield to the parent whenever he interposes, that he will make no opposition. I can assure you from experience, having literally practised this method myself, that I never had a child of twelve months old, but who would suffer me to take any thing from him or her, without the least mark of anger or dissatisfaction; while they would not suffer any other to do so without the bittereſt complaints. You will easily perceive how this is to be extended gradually and universally, from one thing to another, from contradicting to commanding them. But this, and several other remarks upon establishing and preserving authority, must be referred to another letter.

LETTER III.

DEAR SIR.

THE theory laid down in my laſt letter, for eſtabliſhing an early and abſolute authority over children, is of much greater moment than, perhaps, you will immediately apprehend. There is a great diverſity in the temper and diſpoſition of children; and no leſs in the penetration, prudence and reſolution of parents. From all theſe circumſtances, difficulties ariſe, which increaſe very faſt as the work is delayed. Some children have naturally very ſtiff and obſtinate tempers, and ſome have a certain pride, or if you pleaſe, greatneſs of mind, which makes them think it a mean thing to yield. This diſpoſition is often greatly ſtrengthened in thoſe of high birth, by the ideas of their own dignity and importance, inſtilled into them from their mother's milk. I have known a boy not ſix years of age, who made it a point of honor not to cry when he was beat, even by his parents. Other children have ſo ſtrong paſſions, or ſo great ſenſibility, that if they receive correction, they will cry immoderately, and either be, or ſeem to be, affected to ſuch a degree, as to endanger their health or life. Neither is it uncommon for the parents in ſuch a caſe to give up the point, and if they do not aſk pardon, at leaſt they give very genuine marks of repentance and ſorrow for what they have done.

I have ſaid this is not uncommon, but I may rather aſk you whether you know any parents at all, who have ſo much prudence and firmneſs as not to be diſcouraged in the one caſe, or to relent in the other? At the ſame time it muſt always be remembered, that the correction is wholly loſt which does not produce abſolute ſubmiſſion. Perhaps I may ſay it is more than loſt, becauſe it will irritate inſtead of reforming them, and will inſtruct or perfect them in the art of overcoming their parents, which they will not fail to manifeſt on a future opportunity. It is ſur-

priſing to think how early children will diſcover the weak ſide of their parents, and what ingenuity they will ſhow in obtaining their favor or avoiding their diſpleaſure. I think I have obſerved a child in treaty or expoſtulation with a parent, diſcover more conſummate policy at ſeven years of age, than the parent himſelf, even when attempting to cajole him with artful evaſions and ſpecious promiſes. On all theſe accounts, it muſt be a vaſt advantage that a habit of ſubmiſſion ſhould be brought on ſo early, that even memory itſelf ſhall not be able to reach back to its beginning. Unleſs this is done, there are many caſes in which, after the beſt management, the authority will be imperfect; and ſome in which any thing that deſerves that name will be impoſſible. There are ſome families, not contemptible either in ſtation or character, in which the parents are literally and properly obedient to their children, are forced to do things againſt their will, and chidden if they diſcover the leaſt backwardneſs to comply. If you know none ſuch, I am ſure I do.

Let us now proceed to the beſt means of preſerving authority, and the way in which it ought to be daily exerciſed. I will trace this to its very ſource. Whatever authority you exerciſe over either children or ſervants, or as a magiſtrate over other citizens, it ought to be dictated by conſcience, and directed by a ſenſe of duty. Paſſion or reſentment ought to have as little place as poſſible; or rather, to ſpeak properly, though few can boaſt of having arrived at full perfection, it ought to have no place at all. Reproof or correction given in a rage, is always conſidered by him to whom it is adminiſtered, as the effect of weakneſs in you, and therefore the demerit of the offence will be either wholly denied or ſoon forgotten. I have heard ſome parents often ſay, that they cannot correct their children unleſs they are angry; to whom I have uſually anſwered, then you ought not to correct them at all. Every one would be ſenſible, that for a magiſtrate to diſcover an intemperate rage in pronouncing ſentence againſt a criminal, would be highly indecent. Ought not parents to puniſh their children in the ſame diſpaſſionate manner? Ought they not to be at leaſt equally con-

cerned to discharge their duty in the best manner, one case as in the other?

He who would preserve his authority over his children, should be particularly watchful of his own conduct. You may as well pretend to force people to love what is not amiable, as to reverence what is not respectable. A decency of conduct, therefore, and dignity of deportment, is highly serviceable for the purpose we have now in view. Lest this, however, should be mistaken, I must put in a caution, that I do not mean to recommend keeping children at too great a distance by a uniform sternness and severity of carriage. This, I think, is not necessary, even when they are young; and it may, to children of some tempers, be very hurtful when they are old. By and by you shall receive from me a quite contrary direction. But by dignity of carriage, I mean parents showing themselves always cool and reasonable in their own conduct; prudent and cautious in their conversation with regard to the rest of mankind; not fretful or impatient, or passionately fond of their own peculiarities; and though gentle and affectionate to their children, yet avoiding levity in their presence. This probably is the meaning of the precept of the ancients, *maxima debetur pueris reverentia.* I would have them chearful, yet serene. In short, I would have their familiarity to be evidently an act of condescension. Believe it, my dear sir, that which begets esteem, will not fail to produce subjection.

That this may not be carried too far, I would recommend every expression of affection and kindness to children when it is safe, that is to say, when their behaviour is such as to deserve it. There is no opposition at all between parental tenderness and parental authority. They are the best supports to each other. It is not only lawful, but will be of service, that parents should discover the greatest fondness for children in infancy, and make them perceive distinctly with how much pleasure they gratify all their innocent inclinations. This, however, must always be done when they are quiet, gentle, and submissive in their carriage. Some have found fault with giving them, for doing well, little rewards of sweet-meats and

play-things, as tending to make them mercenary, and leading them to look upon the indulgence of appetite as the chief good. This I apprehend, is rather refining too much: the great point is, that they be rewarded for doing good, and not for doing evil. When they are croſs and froward, I would never buy peace, but force it. Nothing can be more weak and fooliſh, or more deſtructive of authority, than when children are noiſy and in an ill humor, to give them or promiſe them ſomething to appeaſe them. When the Roman emperors began to give penſions and ſubſidies to the Northern nations to keep them quiet, a man might have foreſeen without the ſpirit of prophecy, who would be maſter in a little time. The caſe is exactly the ſame with children. They will ſoon avail themſelves of this eaſineſs in their parents, command favors inſtead of begging them, and be inſolent when they ſhould be grateful.

The ſame conduct ought to be uniformly preſerved as children advance in years and underſtanding. Let parents try to convince them how much they have their real intereſt at heart. Sometimes children will make a requeſt, and receive a haſty or froward denial: yet upon reflection the thing appears not to be unreaſonable, and finally it is granted; and whether it be right or wrong, ſometimes by the force of importunity, it is extorted. If parents expect either gratitude or ſubmiſſion for favors ſo ungraciouſly beſtowed, they will find themſelves egregiouſly miſtaken. It is their duty to proſecute, and it ought to be their comfort to ſee, the happineſs of their children; and therefore they ought to lay it down as a rule, never to give a ſudden or haſty refuſal; but when any thing is propoſed to them, conſider deliberately and fully whether it is proper—and after that, either grant it chearfully, or deny it firmly.

It is a noble ſupport of authority, when it is really and viſibly directed to the moſt important end. My meaning in this, I hope, is not obſcure. The end I conſider as moſt important is, the glory of God in the eternal happineſs and ſalvation of children. Whoever believes in a future ſtate, whoever has a juſt ſenſe of the importance of eternity to himſelf, cannot fail to have a like concern

for his offspring. This ſhould be his end both in inſtruction and government; and when it viſibly appears that he is under the conſtraint of conſcience, and that either reproof or correction are the fruit of ſanctified love, it will give them irreſiſtible force. I will tell you here, with all the ſimplicity neceſſary in ſuch a ſituation, what I have often ſaid in my courſe of paſtoral viſitation in families, where there is in many caſes, through want of judgment, as well as want of principle, a great neglect of authority. "Uſe your authority for God, and he will ſupport it.—Let it always be ſeen that you are more diſpleaſed at ſin than at folly. What a ſhame is it, that if a child ſhall, through the inattention and levity of youth, break a diſh or a pane of the window, by which you may loſe the value of a few pence, you ſhould ſtorm and rage at him with the utmoſt fury, or perhaps beat him with unmerciful ſeverity; but if he tells a lie, or takes the name of God in vain, or quarrels with his neighbors, he ſhall eaſily obtain pardon: or perhaps, if he is reproved by others, you will juſtify him, and take his part."

You cannot eaſily believe the weight that it gives to family authority, when it appears viſibly to proceed from a ſenſe of duty, and to be itſelf an act of obedience to God. This will produce coolneſs and compoſure in the manner, it will direct and enable a parent to mix every expreſſion of heart-felt tenderneſs, with the moſt ſevere and needful reproofs. It will make it quite conſiſtent to affirm, that the rod itſelf is an evidence of love, and that it is true of every pious parent on earth, what is ſaid of our Father in heaven: "Whom the Lord loveth, he chaſteneth, and ſcourgeth every ſon whom he receiveth. If ye endure chaſtening, God dealeth with you as with ſons: for what ſon is he whom the Father chaſteneth not? But if ye are without chaſtiſement, whereof all are partakers, then ye are baſtards and not ſons." With this maxim in your eye, I would recommend, that ſolemnity take the place of, and be ſubſtituted for ſeverity. When a child, for example, diſcovers a very depraved diſpoſition, inſtead of multiplying ſtripes in proportion to the reiterated provocations, every circumſtance ſhould be introduced, whe-

ther in reproof or punishment, that can either discover the seriousness of your mind, or make an impression of awe and reverence upon his. The time may be fixed before hand—at some distance—The Lord's day—his own birth-day—with many other circumstances that may be so special that it is impossible to enumerate them. I shall just repeat what you have heard often from me in conversation, that several pious persons made it an invariable custom, as soon as their children could read, never to correct them, but after they had read over all the passages of scripture which command it, and generally accompanied it with prayer to God for his blessing. I know well with what ridicule this would be treated by many, if publicly mentioned; but that does not shake my judgment in the least, being fully convinced it is a most excellent method, and that it is impossible to blot from the minds of children, while they live upon earth, the impressions that are made by these means, or to abate the veneration they will retain for the parents who acted such a part.

Suffer me here to observe to you, that such a plan as the above requires judgment, reflection, and great attention in your whole conduct. Take heed that there be nothing admitted in the intervals, that counteract it. Nothing is more destructive of authority, than frequent disputes and chiding upon small matters. This is often more irksome to children than parents are aware of. It weakens their influence insensibly, and in time makes their opinion and judgment of little weight, if not wholly contemptible. As before I recommended dignity in your general conduct, so in a particular manner, let the utmost care be taken not to render authority cheap, by too often interposing it. There is really too great a risk to be run in every such instance. If parents will be deciding directly, and censuring every moment, it is to be supposed they will be sometimes wrong, and when this evidently appears, it will take away from the credit of their opinion, and weaken their influence, even where it ought to prevail.

Upon the whole, to encourage you to choose a wise plan, and to adhere to it with firmness, I can venture to assure

you, that there is no doubt of your ſucceſs. To ſubdue a youth after he has been long accuſtomed to indulgence, I take to be in all caſes difficult, and in many impoſſible; but while the body is tender, to bring the mind to ſubmiſſion, to train up a child in the nurture and admonition of the Lord, I know is not impoſſible: and he who hath given the command, can ſcarcely fail to follow it with his bleſſing.

LETTER IV.

DEAR SIR,

HAVING now finiſhed what I propoſed to ſay on the means of eſtabliſhing and preſerving authority, I ſhall proceed to another very important branch of the ſubject, and beg your very particular attention to it, viz. example. Do not, however, ſuppoſe that I mean to enter on that moſt beaten of all topics, the influence of example in general, or to write a diſſertation on the common ſaying, that "example teaches better than precept." An able writer, doubtleſs might ſet even this in ſome new lights, and make it a ſtrong argument with every good man to pay the ſtricteſt attention to his viſible conduct. What we ſee every day has a conſtant and powerful influence on our temper and carriage. Hence ariſe national characters, and national manners, and every characteriſtic diſtinction of age and place. But of this I have already ſaid enough.

Neither is it my purpoſe to put you in mind of the importance of example to enforce inſtruction, or of the ſhamefullneſs of a man's pretending to teach others what he deſpiſes himſelf. This ought in the ſtrongeſt manner to be laid before paſtors and other public perſons, who often defeat habitually by their lives, what they attempt to do occaſionally in the execution of their office. If there remains the leaſt ſuſpicion of your being of that character, theſe letters would have been quite in another ſtrain. I believe there are ſome perſons of very irregular lives,

who have so much natural light in their consciences, that they would be grieved or perhaps offended, if their children should tread exactly in their own steps: but even these, and much less others, who are more hardened, can never be expected to undertake or carry on the system of education, we are now endeavoring to illustrate. Suffer me, however, before I proceed, to make one remark: when I have heard of parents who have been watched by their own children, when drunk, and taken care of, lest they should meet with injury or hurtful accidents—or whose intemperate rage and horrid blasphemies, have, without scruple, been exposed both to children and servants—or who, as has sometimes been the case, were scarcely at the pains to conceal their criminal amours, even from their own offspring—I have often reflected on the degree of impiety of principle, or searedness of conscience, or both united, necessary to support them in such circumstances. Let us leave all such with a mixture of pity and disdain.

By mentioning example, therefore, as an important and necessary branch of the education of children, I have chiefly in view a great number of particulars, which, separately taken, are, or at least are supposed to be, of little moment; yet by their union or frequent repetition, produce important and lasting effects. I have also in view to include all that class of actions, in which there is, or may be, a coincidence between the duties of piety and politeness, and by means of which, the one is incorporated with the other. These are to be introduced under the head of example, because they will appear there to best advantage. and because many of them can hardly be taught or understood in any other way.

This, I apprehend, you will readily approve of, because, though you justly consider religion as the most essentially necessary qualification, you mean at the same time that your children should be fitted for an appearance becoming their station in the world. It is also the more necessary, as many are apt to disjoin wholly the ideas of piety and politeness, and to suppose them not only distinct, but incompatible. This is a dangerous snare to many parents, who think there is no medium between

the groſſeſt ruſticity, and giving way to all the vanity and extravagance of a diſſipated life. Perſons truly pious have often by their conduct given countenance to this miſtake. By a certain narrowneſs of ſentiment and behavior they have become themſelves, and rendered their children unfit for a general intercourſe with mankind, or the public duties of an active life.

You know, Sir, as much as any man, how contrary my opinion and conduct have been upon this ſubject. I cannot help thinking that true religion is not only conſiſtent with, but neceſſary to the perfection of true politeneſs. There is a noble ſentiment to this purpoſe illuſtrated at conſiderable length in the Port-royal eſſays, viz. "That "worldly politeneſs is no more than an imitation or im- "perfect copy of chriſtian charity, being the pretence or "outward appearance, of that deference to the judgment, "and attention to the intereſt of others, which a true "chriſtian has as the rule of his life, and the diſpoſition "of his heart."* I have at preſent in my mind the idea of certain perſons, whom you will eaſily gueſs at, of the firſt quality; one or two of the male, and twice that number at leaſt of the female ſex, in whom piety and high ſtation are united. What a ſweetneſs and complacency of countenance, what a condeſcenſion and gentleneſs of manners, ariſing from the humility of the goſpel being joined to the refined elegance inſeparable from their circumſtances in life!

Be pleaſed to follow me to the other extreme of human ſociety. Let us go to the remoteſt cottage of the wildeſt country, and viſit the family that inhabits it. If they are pious, there is a certain humanity and good will attending their ſimplicity, which makes it highly agreeable. There is alſo a decency in their ſentiments, which, flow-

* The authors of theſe eſſays, commonly called by writers who make mention of them, the gentlemen of Port-Royal, were a ſociety of Janſeniſts in France, who uſed to meet at that place; all of whom were eminent for literature, and many of them of high rank, as will be evident by mentioning the names of Paſcal, Arnaud, and the prince of Conti. The laſt was the author of the eſſay from which the above remark is taken.

ing from the dictates of conscience, is as pleasing in all respects, as the restraint imposed by the rules of good-breeding, with which the persons here in view have little opportunity of being acquainted. On the contrary, unbred country people, when without principle, have generally a savageness and brutality in their carriage, as contrary to good manners as to piety itself. No one has a better opportunity of making observations of this kind, than I have from my office and situation, and I can assure you, that religion is the great polisher of the common people. It even enlarges their understanding as to other things. Having been accustomed to exercise their judgment and reflection on religious subjects, they are capable of talking more sensibly on agriculture, politics, or any common topic of indifferent conversation.

Let me not forget to speak of the middle ranks of life. Here, also, I scruple not to affirm, that whatever sphere a man has been bred in, or attained to, religion is not an injury, but an addition to the politeness of his carriage. They seem indeed to confess their relation to one another, by their reciprocal influence. In promiscuous conversation, as true religion contributes to make men decent or courteous, so true politeness guards them effectually from any outrage against piety or purity. If I were unhappily thrown into mixed or dangerous company, I should not apprehend any thing improper for me to hear from the most wicked man, but from the greatest clown. I have known gentlemen who were infidels in principle, and whose lives, I had reason to believe, were privately very bad, yet in conversation they were guarded, decent and improving; whereas if there come into company a rough, unpolished country gentleman, no man can promise that he will not break out into some profane exclamation or obscene allusion, which it would be wrong to attribute to impiety, so much as to rudeness and want of reflection.

I have been already too long in the introduction, and in giving the reasons for what I propose shall make a part of this branch of the subject, and yet I must make another preliminary remark: there is the greater necessity for uniting piety and politeness in the system of family example,

that as piety is by that means inculcated with the greateſt advantage, ſo politeneſs can ſcarcely be attained in any other way. It is very rare that perſons reach a higher degree of politeneſs, than what they have been formed to in the families of their parents and other near relations. True politeneſs does not conſiſt in dreſs, or a few motions of the body, but in a habit of ſentiment and converſation: the firſt may be learned from a maſter, and in a little time; the laſt only by a long and conſtant intercourſe with thoſe who poſſeſs, and are therefore able to impart it. As the difficulty is certainly greateſt with the female ſex, becauſe they have fewer opportunities of being abroad in the world, I ſhall take an example from among them.

Suppoſe a man of low birth, living in the country, by induſtry and parſimony has become wealthy, and has a daughter to whom he deſires to give a genteel education. He ſends her to your city to a boarding ſchool, for the other which is nearer me, you are pleaſed not to think ſufficient for that purpoſe. She will ſpeedily learn to buy expenſive and faſhionable clothes, and moſt probably be in the very height and extravagance of the faſhion, one of the ſureſt ſigns of a vulgar taſte. She may alſo, if her capacity is tolerable, get rid of her ruſtic air and carriage; and if it be better than ordinary, learn to diſcourſe upon whatever topic is then in vogue, and comes in immediately after the weather, which is the beginning of all converſation. But as her reſidence is only for a time, ſhe returns home, where ſhe can ſee or hear nothing but as before. Muſt ſhe not relapſe ſpeedily into the ſame vulgarity of ſentiment, and perhaps the ſame provincial dialect, to which ſhe had been accuſtomed from her youth? Neither is it impoſſible that ſhe may juſt retain as much of the city ceremonial, as by the incongruous mixture, will render her ridiculous. There is but one ſingle way of eſcape, which we have ſeen ſome young women of merit and capacity take, which is to contract an intimacy with perſons of liberal ſentiments and higher breeding, and be as little among their relations as poſſible. I have given this deſcription to convince you that it is in their father's houſe, and by the converſation and manners, to which

they are there accuſtomed, that children muſt be formed to politeneſs, as well as to virtue. I carry this matter ſo far, that I think it a diſadvantage to be bred too high, as well as too low. I do not deſire, and have always declined any opportunities given me of having my children reſide long in families of high rank. I was afraid they would contract an air and manner unſuitable to what was to be their condition for the remainder of their lives. I would wiſh to give my children as juſt, as noble, and as elegant ſentiments as poſſible, to fit them for rational converſation, but a dreſs and carriage ſuited to their ſtation, and not inconſiſtent with the meekneſs of the goſpel.

Though the length of this digreſſion, or explanatory introduction, has made it impoſſible to ſay much in this letter on forming children's character and manners by example, before I conclude I will give one direction which is pretty comprehenſive. Give the utmoſt attention to the manner of receiving and entertaining ſtrangers in your family, as well as to your ſentiments and expreſſions with regard to them when they are gone. I am fully perſuaded that the plaineſt and ſhorteſt road to real politeneſs of carriage, and the moſt amiable ſort of hoſpitality, is to think of others juſt as a chriſtian ought, and to expreſs theſe thoughts with modeſty and candor. This will keep you at an equal diſtance from a ſurly and moroſe carriage on the one hand, and a fawning cringing obſequiouſneſs, or unneceſſary compliment and ceremony, on the other. As theſe are circumſtances to which children in early life are very attentive, and which occur conſtantly in their preſence, it is of much moment what ſentiments they imbibe from the behavior of their parents. I do not mean only their learning from them an eaſe and dignity of carriage, or the contrary; but alſo, ſome moral or immoral habits of the laſt conſequence. If they perceive you happy and lifted up with the viſit or countenance of perſons of high rank, ſolicitous to entertain them properly, ſubmiſſive and flattering in your manner of ſpeaking to them, vain and apt to boaſt of your connexion with them: and if, on the contrary, they perceive you hardly civil to perſons of inferior ſtations, or narrow circumſtances, impatient of

their company, and immediately ſeizing the opportunity of their departure to deſpiſe or expoſe them; will not this naturally lead the young mind to conſider riches and high ſtation as the great ſources of earthly happineſs? Will it not give a ſtrong bias to their whole deſires and ſtudies, as well as viſibly affect their behavior to others in ſocial life. Do not think that this is too nice and refined: the firſt impreſſions upon young perſons, though inconſiderable in themſelves, have often a great as well as laſting effect.

I remember to have read many years ago, in the archbiſhop of Cambray's education of a daughter, an advice to parents to let their children perceive that they eſteem others, not according to their ſtation or outward ſplendor, but their virtue and real worth. It muſt be acknowledged that there are ſome marks of reſpect due to men, according to their place in civil life, which a good man would not fail to give them, even for conſcience ſake. But it is an eaſy matter, in perfect conſiſtency with this, by more frequent voluntary intercourſe, as well as by our uſual manner of ſpeaking, to pay that homage which is due to piety, to expreſs our contempt or indignation at vice, or meanneſs of every kind. I think it no inconſiderable addition to this remark, that we ſhould be as cautious of eſtimating *happiness* as *virtue*, by outward ſtation; and keep at the ſame diſtance from envying as from flattering the great.

But what I muſt particularly recommend to you, is to avoid that common but deteſtable cuſtom of receiving perſons with courteſy, and all the marks of real friendſhip in your houſe; and the moment they are gone, falling upon their character and conduct with unmerciful ſeverity. I am ſenſible there are ſome caſes, though they are not numerous, in which it may be lawful to ſay of others behind their back, what it would be at leaſt imprudent or unſafe to ſay in their own preſence. Neither would I exclude parents from the advantage of pointing out to their children the miſtakes and vices of others, as a warning or leſſon of inſtruction to themſelves. Yet as detraction in general is to be avoided at all times; ſo of all others the moſt improper ſeaſon to ſpeak to any man's prejudice, is,

after you have just received and treated him in an hospitable manner, as a friend. There is something mean in it, and something so nearly allied to hypocrisy and disingenuity, that I would not choose to act such a part even to those whom I would take another opportunity of pointing out to my children, as persons whose conversation they should avoid, and whose conduct they should abhor.

In every station, and among all ranks, this rule is often transgressed; but there is one point in which it is more frequently and more universally transgressed than in any other, and that is by turning the absent into ridicule, for any thing odd or aukward in their behavior. I am sorry to say that this is an indecorum that prevails in several families of high rank. A man of inferior station, for some particular reason, is admitted to their company. He is perhaps not well acquainted with the rules of politeness, and the presence of his superiors, to which he is unaccustomed, increases his embarrassment. Immediately on his departure, a petulant boy or giddy girl will set about mimicking his motions, and repeating his phrases, to the great entertainment of the company, who apparently derive much self-satisfaction from a circumstance in which there is no merit at all. If any person renders himself justly ridiculous, by affecting a character which he is unable to sustain, let him be treated with the contempt he deserves. But there is something very ungenerous in people treating their inferiors with disdain, merely because the same Providence that made their ancestors great, left the others in a low sphere.

It has often given me great indignation to see a gentleman or his wife, of real worth, good understanding, but simple manners, despised and ridiculed for a defect which they could not remedy, and that often by persons the most insignificant and frivolous, who never uttered a sentence in their lives that deserved to be remembered or repeated. But if this conduct is ungenerous in the great, how diverting is it to see the same disposition carried down through all the inferior ranks, and showing itself in a silly triumph of every class over those who are supposed to be below them? I have known many persons, whose station

was not ſuperior to mine, take great pleaſure in expreſſing their contempt of *vulgar ideas* and *low life;* and even a tradeſman's wife in a city, glorying over the unpoliſhed manners of her country acquaintance.

Upon the whole, as there is no diſpoſition to which young perſons are more prone than deriſion, or, as the author I cited above, Mr. Fenelon, expreſſes it, *un esprit mocqueur et malin*—and few that parents are more apt to cheriſh—under the idea of its being a ſign of ſprightlineſs and vivacity—there is none which a pious and prudent parent ſhould take greater care to reſtrain by admonition, and deſtroy by a contrary example.

LETTER V.

DEAR SIR,

LET us now proceed to conſider more fully what it is to form children to piety by example. This is a ſubject of great extent, and perhaps, of difficulty. The difficulty, however, does not conſiſt either in the abſtruſeneſs of the arguments, or uncertainty of the facts upon which they are founded, but in the minuteneſs or trifling nature of the circumſtances, taken ſeparately, which makes them often either wholly unnoticed or greatly undervalued. It is a ſubject, which, if I miſtake not, is much more eaſily conceived than explained. If you have it conſtantly in your mind, that your whole viſible deportment will powerfully, though inſenſibly, influence the opinions and future conduct of your children, it will give a form or colour, if I may ſpeak ſo, to every thing you ſay or do. There are numberleſs and nameleſs inſtances in which this reflection will make you ſpeak, or refrain from ſpeaking, act, or abſtain from ſome circumſtances of action, in what you are engaged in; nor will this be accompanied with any reluctance in the one caſe, or conſtraint in the other,

But I must not content myself with this. My profession gives me many opportunities of observing, that the impression made by general truths, however justly stated or fully proved, is seldom strong or lasting. Let me, therefore descend to practice, and illustrate what I have said by examples. Here again a difficulty occurs. If I give a particular instance, it will perhaps operate no farther than recommending a like conduct in circumstances the same, or perhaps perfectly similar. For example, I might say, in speaking to the disadvantage of absent persons, I beseech you never fail to add the reason why you take such liberty, and indeed never take that liberty at all, but when it can be justified upon the principles of prudence, candor and charity. A thing may be right in itself, but children should be made to see why it is right. This is one instance of exemplary caution, but if I were to add a dozen more to it, they would only be detached precepts; whereas I am anxious to take in the whole extent of edifying example. In order to this, let me range or divide what I have to say, under distinct heads. A parent who wishes that his example should be a speaking lesson to his children, should order it so as to convince them, that he considers religion as necessary, respectable, amiable, profitable, and delightful. I am sensible that some of these characters may seem so nearly allied, as scarcely to admit of a distinction. Many parts of a virtuous conduct fall under more than one of these denominations. Some actions perhaps deserve all the epithets here mentioned, without exception and without prejudice one of another. But the distinctions seem to me very useful, for there is certainly a class of actions which may be said to belong peculiarly, or at least eminently, to each of these different heads. By taking them separately, therefore, it will serve to point out more fully the extent of your duty, and to suggest it when it would not otherwise occur, as well as to set the obligation to it in the stronger light.

1. You should, in your general deportment, make your children perceive that you look upon religion as absolutely necessary. I place this first, because it appears to me first both in point of order and force. I am far from being

againſt taking all pains to ſhow that religion is rational and honorable in itſelf, and vice the contrary; but I deſpiſe the fooliſh refinement of thoſe, who, through fear of making children mercenary, are for being very ſparing of the mention of heaven or hell. Such conduct is apt to make them conceive, that a neglect of their duty is only falling ſhort of a degree of honor and advantage, which, for the gratification of their paſſions, they are very willing to relinquiſh. Many parents are much more ready to tell their children ſuch or ſuch a thing is mean, and not like a gentleman, than to warn them that they will thereby incur the diſpleaſure of their Maker. But when the practices are really and deeply criminal, as in ſwearing and lying, it is quite improper to reſt the matter there. I admit that they are both mean, and that juſtice ought to be done to them in this reſpect, but I contend that it ſhould only be a ſecondary conſideration.

Let not human reaſonings be put in the balance with divine wiſdom. The care of our ſouls is repreſented in ſcripture as the one thing needful. He makes a miſerable bargain, who gains the whole world and loſes his own ſoul. It is not the native beauty of virtue, or the outward credit of it, or the inward ſatisfaction ariſing from it, or even all theſe combined together, that will be ſufficient to change our natures and govern our conduct; but a deep conviction, that unleſs we are reconciled to God, we ſhall without doubt periſh everlaſtingly.

You will ſay, this is very true and very fit for a pulpit —but what is that claſs of actions that ſhould impreſs it habitually on the minds of children? perhaps you will even ſay, what one action will any good man be guilty of—much more habitual conduct—that can tend to weaken their belief of it! This is the very point which I mean to explain. It is certainly poſſible that a man may at ſtated times give out that he looks upon religion to be abſolutely neceſſary and yet his conduct in many particulars may have no tendency to impreſs this on the minds of his children. If he ſuffers particular religious duties to be eaſily diſplaced, to be ſhortened, poſtponed or omitted, upon the moſt trifling accounts, depend upon it, this will make

religion in general seem less necessary, to those who observe it. If an unpleasant day will keep a man from public worship, when perhaps a hurricane will not keep him from an election meeting—if he chooses to take physic, or give it to his children on the Lord's day, when it could be done with equal ease on the day before or after—if he will more readily allow his servants to pay a visit to their friends on that day than any other, though he has reason to believe they will spend it in junketing and idleness—it will not be easy to avoid suspecting that worldly advantage is what determines his choice.

Take an example or two more on this head. Supposing a man usually to worship God in his family; if he sometimes omits it—if he allow every little business to interfere with it—if company will make him dispense with it, or shift it from its proper season—believe me, the idea of religion being every man's first and great concern, it is in a good measure weakened, if not wholly lost. It is a very nice thing in religion to know the real connexion between, and the proper mixture of spirit and form. The form without the spirit is good for nothing; but on the other hand, the spirit without the form, never yet existed. I am of opinion, that punctual and even scrupulous regularity in all those duties that occur periodically, is the way to make them easy and pleasant to those who attend them. They also become, like all other habits, in some degree necessary; so that those who have been long accustomed to them, feel an uneasiness in families where they are generally or frequently neglected. I cannot help also mentioning to you, the great danger of paying and receiving visits on the Lord's day, unless when it is absolutely necessary. It is a matter not merely difficult, but wholly impracticable, in such cases, to guard effectually against improper subjects of conversation. Nor is this all, for let the conversation be what it will, I contend that the duties of the family and the closet are fully sufficient to employ the whole time; which must therefore be wasted or misapplied by the intercourse of strangers.

I only further observe, that I know no circumstance from which your opinion of the necessity of religion will

appear with the greater clearneſs, or carry it in greater force, than your behaviour towards and treatment of your children in time of dangerous ſickneſs. Certainly there is no time in their whole lives when the neceſſity appears more urgent, or the opportunity more favourable, for impreſſing their minds with a ſenſe of the things that belong to their peace. What ſhall we ſay then of thoſe parents, who, through fear of alarming their minds, and augmenting their diſorder, will not ſuffer any mention to be made to them of the approach of death, or the importance of eternity? I will relate to you an example of this. A young gentleman of eſtate in my pariſh, was taken ill of a dangerous fever in a friend's houſe at a diſtance. I went to ſee him in his illneſs, and his mother, a widow lady, intreated me not to ſay any thing alarming to him, and not to pray with him, but to go to prayer in another room, wherein ſhe wiſely obſerved, it would have the ſame effect. The young man himſelf ſoon found that I did not act as he had expected, and was ſo impatient that it became neceſſary to give him the true reaſon. On this he inſiſted in the moſt poſitive manner, that all reſtriction ſhould be taken off, which was done. What was the conſequence? He was exceedingly pleaſed and compoſed; and if this circumſtance did not haſten, it certainly neither hindered nor retarded his recovery.

Be pleaſed to remark, that the young gentleman here ſpoken of, neither was at that time, nor is yet, ſo far as I am able to judge, truly religious; and therefore I have formed a fixed opinion, that in this, as in many other inſtances, the wiſdom of man diſappoints itſelf. Pious advice and conſolation, if but tolerably adminiſtered in ſickneſs, are not only uſeful to the ſoul, but ſerve particularly to calm an agitated mind, to bring the animal ſpirits to an eaſy flow, and the whole frame into ſuch a ſtate as will beſt favor the operation of medicine, or the efforts of the conſtitution, to throw off or conquer the diſeaſe.

Suffer me to wander a little from my ſubject, by obſerving to you, that as I do not think the great are to be much envied for any thing, ſo they are truly and heartily to be pitied for the deception that is uſually put upon them by

flattery and falſe tenderneſs. Many of them are brought up with ſo much delicacy, that they are never ſuffered to ſee any miſerable or afflicting object, nor, ſo far as can be hindered, to hear any affecting ſtory of diſtreſs. If they themſelves are ſick, how many abſurd and palpable lies are told them by their friends? and as for phyſicians I may ſafely ſay, few of them are much conſcience bound in this matter. Now, let the ſucceſs of theſe meaſures be what it will, the only fruit to be reaped from them is to make a poor dying ſinner miſtake his or her condition, and vainly dream of earthly happineſs, while haſtening to the pit of perdition. But, as I ſaid before, men are often taken in their own craftineſs. It oftentimes happens that ſuch perſons, by an ignorant ſervant, or officious neighbor, or ſome unlucky accident, make a ſudden diſcovery of their true ſituation, and the ſhock frequently proves fatal.—O! how much more deſirable is it—how much more like the reaſon of men, as well as the faith of chriſtians—to conſider and prepare for what muſt inevitably come to paſs? I cannot eaſily conceive any thing more truly noble, than for a perſon in health and vigor, in honor and opulence, by voluntary reflection to ſympathize with others in diſtreſs; and by a well founded confidence in divine mercy, to obtain the victory over the fear of death.

2. You ought to live ſo as to make religion appear reſpectable. Religion is a venerable thing in itſelf, and it ſpreads an air of dignity over a perſon's whole deportment. I have ſeen a common tradeſman, merely becauſe he was a man of true piety and undeniable worth, treated by his children, apprentices and ſervants, with a much greater degree of deference and ſubmiſſion, than is commonly given to men of ſuperior ſtation, without that character. Many of the ſame meanneſſes are avoided, by a gentleman from a principle of honor, and by a good man from a principle of conſcience. The firſt keeps out of the company of common people, becauſe they are below him—the laſt is cautious of mixing with them, becauſe of that levity and profanity that is to be expected from them. If, then, religion is really venerable when ſincere, a re-

ſpectable conduct ought to be maintained, as a proof of your own integrity, as well as to recommend it to your children. To this add, if you pleaſe, that as reverence is the peculiar duty of children to their parents, any thing that tends to leſſen it is more deeply felt by them than by others who obſerve it. When I have ſeen a parent, in the preſence of his child, meanly wrangling with his ſervant, telling extravagant ſtories, or otherwiſe expoſing his vanity, credulity or folly, I have felt juſt the ſame proportion of ſympathy and tenderneſs for the one, that I did of contempt or indignation at the other.

What has been ſaid, will, in part, explain the errors which a parent ought to ſhun, and what circumſtances he ought to attend to, that religion may appear reſpectable. All meanneſſes, whether of ſentiment, converſation, dreſs, manners, or employment, are carefully to be avoided. You will apply this properly to yourſelf. I may, however, juſt mention, that there is a conſiderable difference in all theſe particulars, according to men's different ſtations. The ſame actions are mean in one ſtation, that are not ſo in another. The thing itſelf, however, ſtill remains; as there is an order and cleanlineſs at the table of tradeſmen, that is different from the elegance of a gentleman's, or the ſumptuouſneſs of a prince's or nobleman's. But to make the matter ſtill plainer by particular examples. I look upon talkativeneſs and vanity to be among the greateſt enemies to dignity. It is needleſs to ſay how much vanity is contrary to true religion; and as to the other, which may ſeem rather an infirmity than a ſin, we are expreſsly cautioned againſt it, and commanded to be ſwift to hear, and ſlow to ſpeak. Sudden anger, too, and loud clamorous ſcolding, are at once contrary to piety and dignity. Parents ſhould, therefore, acquire as much as poſſible, a compoſure of ſpirit, and meekneſs of language; nor are there many circumſtances that will more recommend religion to children, when they ſee that this ſelf command is the effect of principle, and a ſenſe of duty.

There is a weakneſs I have obſerved in many parents, to ſhow a partial fondneſs for ſome of their children, to the neglect, and in many caſes approaching to a jealouſy

or hatred of others. Sometimes we ſee a mother diſcover an exceſſive partiality to a handſome daughter, in compariſon of thoſe that are more homely in their figure. This is a barbarity, which would be truly incredible, did not experience prove that it really exiſts. One would think they ſhould rather be excited by natural affection, to give all poſſible encouragement to thoſe who labor under a diſadvantage, and beſtow every attainable accompliſhment to balance the defects of outward form. At other times we ſee a partiality which cannot be accounted for at all, where the moſt ugly, peeviſh, froward child of the whole family, is the favorite of both parents. Reaſon ought to counteract theſe errors; but piety ought to extirpate them entirely. I do not ſtay to mention the bad effects that flow from them, my purpoſe being only to ſhow the excellence of that character which is exempted from them.

The real dignity of religion will alſo appear in the conduct of a good man towards his ſervants. It will point out the true and proper diſtinction between condeſcenſion and meanneſs. Humility is the very ſpirit of the goſpel. Therefore, hear your ſervants with patience, examine their conduct with candor, treat them with all the humanity and gentleneſs that is conſiſtent with unremitted authority: when they are ſick, viſit them in perſon, provide remedies for them, ſympathize with them, and ſhow them that you do ſo; take care of their intereſts; aſſiſt them with your counſel and influence to obtain what is their right. But, on the other hand, never make yourſelf their proper companion: do not ſeem to taſte their ſociety; do not hear their jokes, or aſk their news, or tell them yours. Believe me, this will never make you either beloved or eſteemed by your ſervants themſelves; and it will greatly derogate from the dignity of true religion in the eyes of your children. Suffer me alſo to caution you againſt that moſt unjuſt and illiberal practice, of exerciſing your wit in humorous ſtrokes upon your ſervants, before company, or while they wait at table. I do not know any thing ſo evidently mean, that is at the ſame time ſo common. It is I think, juſt ſuch a cowardly thing as to beat a man who is bound; becauſe the ſervant, however happy

a repartee might occur to him, is not at liberty to anſwer, but at the riſk of having his bones broken. In this as in many other particulars, reaſon, refinement, and liberal manners, teach exactly the ſame thing with religion, and I am happy in being able to add, that religion is generally the moſt powerful, as well as the moſt uniform principle of decent conduct.

I ſhall have done with this particular, when I have obſerved, that thoſe who are engaged in public, or what I may call political life, have an excellent opportunity of making religion appear truly reſpectable. What I mean is, by ſhowing themſelves firm and incorruptible, in ſupporting thoſe meaſures that appear beſt calculated for promoting the intereſt of religion, and the good of mankind. In all theſe caſes, I admire that man who has principles, whoſe principles are known, and whom every body deſpairs of being able to ſeduce, or bring over to the oppoſite intereſt. I do not commend furious and intemperate zeal. Steadineſs is a much better, and quite a different thing. I would contend with any man who ſhould ſpeak moſt calmly, but I would alſo contend with him who ſhould act moſt firmly. As for your placebo's your prudent, courtly, compliant gentlemen, whoſe vote in aſſembly will tell you where they dined the day before, I hold them very cheap indeed, as you very well know. I do not enter further into this argument, but conclude at this time, by obſerving, that public meaſures are always embraced under pretence of principle; and therefore an uniform uncorrupted public character is one of the beſt evidences of real principle. The free thinking gentry tell us, upon this ſubject, that "every man has his price." It lies out of my way to attempt refuting them at preſent, but it is to be hoped there are many whoſe price is far above their reach. If ſome of my near relations, who took ſo much pains to attach me to the intereſt of evangelical truth, had been governed by court influence in their political conduct, it had not been in my power to have eſteemed their character, or perhaps to have adhered to their inſtructions. But as things now ſtand, I have done both from the beginning, and I hope God will enable me by his grace, to continue to do ſo to the end of life.

LETTERS
ON
MARRIAGE.

LETTER I.

I OFFER, with ſome heſitation, a few reflections upon the married ſtate. I expreſs myſelf thus, becauſe the ſubject has been ſo often and ſo fully treated, and by writers of the firſt claſs, that it may be thought nothing now remains to be ſaid that can merit attention. My only apology is, that what I offer is the fruit of real obſervation and perſonal reflection. It is not a copy of any man's writings, but of my own thoughts; and therefore if the ſentiments ſhould not be in themſelves wholly new, they may poſſibly appear in a light not altogether common. I ſhall give you them in the way of aphoriſms or obſervations; and ſubjoin to each a few thoughts by way of proof or illuſtration.

1. Nothing can be more contrary to reaſon or public utility, than the converſation and writings of thoſe who turn matrimony into ridicule; yet it is in many caſes, as weakly defended, as it is unjuſtly attacked.

Thoſe who treat marriage with ridicule, act in direct and deliberate oppoſition to the order of providence, and

to the conſtitution of the ſociety of which they are members. The true reaſon why they are borne with ſo patiently, is, that the Author of our nature has implanted in us inſtinctive propenſities, which are by much too ſtrong for their feeble attacks.—But if we are to eſtimate the malignity of a man's conduct or ſentiments, not from their effect, but from their native tendency, and his inward diſpoſition, it is not eaſy to imagine any thing more criminal, than an attempt to bring marriage into diſeſteem. It is plainly an effort not only to deſtroy the happineſs, but to prevent the exiſtence of human nature. A man who continues through life in a ſingle ſtate, ought, in juſtice to endeavor to ſatisfy the public that his caſe is ſingular, and that he has ſome inſuperable obſtacle to plead in his excuſe. If, inſtead of this, he reaſons in defence of his own conduct, and takes upon him to condemn that of others, it is at once incredible and abſurd: That is to ſay, he can ſcarcely be believed to be ſincere. And whether he be ſincere or not, he deſerves to be deteſted.

In ſupport of the laſt part of my remark, let it be obſerved, that thoſe who write in defence of marriage, uſually give ſuch ſublime and exalted deſcriptions, as are not realized in one caſe of a thouſand; and therefore cannot be a juſt motive to a conſiderate man. Inſtead of inſiſting on the abſolute neceſſity of marriage for the ſervice of the ſtate, and the ſolid advantages that ariſe from it, in ordinary caſes; they give us a certain refined idea of felicity, which hardly exiſts any where but in the writer's imagination. Even the Spectator, than whom there is hardly in our language a more juſt and rational writer, after ſaying many excellent things in defence of marriage, ſcarcely ever fails to draw the character of a lady in ſuch terms, that I may ſafely ſay not above one that anſwers the deſcription is to be found in a pariſh, or perhaps a country. Now, is it not much better to leave the matter to the force of nature, than to urge it by ſuch arguments as theſe? Is the manner of thinking induced by ſuch writings, likely to haſten or poſtpone a man's entering into the marriage ſtate?

There is alſo a fault I think to be found in almoſt every writer who ſpeaks in favor of the female ſex, that they over-rate the charms of the outward form. This is the caſe in all romances—a claſs of writings to which the world is very little indebted.—The ſame thing may be ſaid of plays, where the heroine for certain, and often all the ladies that are introduced, are repreſented as inimitably beautiful. Even Mr. Addiſon himſelf in his admirable deſcription of Martia, which he puts in the mouth of Juba, though it begins with,

'Tis not a set of features or complexion, &c.
yet could not help inſerting
True she is fair; oh, how divinely fair!

Now, I apprehend this is directly contrary to what ſhould be the deſign of every moral writer. Men are naturally too apt to be carried away with the admiration of a beautiful face. Muſt it not, therefore, confirm them in this error, when beauty is made an eſſential part of every amiable character? The preference ſuch writers pretend to give to the mental qualities, goes but a little way to remedy the evil. If they are never ſeparated in the deſcription, wherever men find the one, they will preſume upon the other. But is this according to truth, or agreeable to experience? What vaſt numbers of the moſt valuable women are to be found, who are by no means "divinely fair?" Are theſe all to be neglected then? Or is it not certain, from experience, that there is not a ſingle quality, on which matrimonial happineſs depends ſo little, as outward form? Every other quality that is good, will go a certain length to atone for what is bad; as, for example, if a woman is active and induſtrious in her family, it will make a huſband bear with more patience a little anxiety of countenance, or fretfulneſs of temper, though in themſelves diſagreeable. But (always ſuppoſing the honey-moon to be over) I do not think that beauty atones in the leaſt degree for any bad quality whatſoever; it is, on the contrary, an aggravation of them, being conſidered as a breach of faith, or deception, by holding out a falſe ſignal.

2. In the married ſtate in general, there is not ſo much happineſs as young lovers dream of; nor is there by far ſo much unhappineſs, as looſe authors univerſally ſuppoſe.

The firſt part of this aphoriſm will probably be eaſily admitted. Before mentioning, however, the little I mean to ſay upon it, I beg leave to obſerve, that it would be quite wrong to blame the tenderneſs and fervency of affection, by which the ſexes are drawn to one another, and that generous devotedneſs of hearts which is often to be ſeen on one, and ſometimes on both ſides. This is nature itſelf; and when under the reſtraint of reaſon, and government of prudence, may be greatly ſubſervient to the future happineſs of life. But there is certainly an extravagance of ſentiment and language on this ſubject, that is at once ridiculous in itſelf, and the proper cauſe, in due time, of wretchedneſs and diſappointment.

Let any man, who has outlived theſe ſenſations himſelf, and has leiſure to be amuſed, dip a little into the love ſongs that have been compoſed and publiſhed from Anacreon to the preſent day, and what a fund of entertainment will he find provided for him! The heathen gods and goddeſſes are the ſtanding and lawful means of celebrating the praiſes of a miſtreſs before whom, no doubt, Venus for beauty, and Minerva for wiſdom, muſt go for nothing. Every image in nature has been called up to heighten our idea of female charms—the paleneſs of the lily, the freſhneſs of the roſe, the bluſh of the violet, and the vermillion of the peach. This is even ſtill nothing. One of the moſt approved topics of a love-ſick writer is, that all nature fades and mourns at the abſence of his fair, and puts on a new bloom at her approach. All this, we know well, has place only in his imagination; for nature proceeds quietly in her courſe, without minding him and his charmer in the leaſt. But we are not yet done. The glory of the heavenly orbs, the luſtre of the ſun himſelf, and even the joys of heaven, are frequently and familiarly introduced, to expreſs a lover's happineſs or hopes. Flames, darts, arrows, and lightning from a female eye, have been expreſſions as old at leaſt as the art of writing, and are ſtill in full vogue.

Some of these we can find no other fault with than that they are a little *outre* as the French express it; but I confess I have sometimes been surprised at the choice of lightning, because it is capable of a double application, and may put us in mind that some wives have lightning in their eyes sufficient to terrify a husband, as well as the maids have to consume a lover.

Does not all this plainly show, that young persons are apt to indulge themselves with romantic expectations of a delight, both extatic and permanent, such as never did and never can exist? And does it not at the same time expose matrimony to the scoffs of libertines, who, knowing that these raptures must soon come to an end, think it sufficient to disparage the state itself, that some inconsiderate persons have not met with in it, what it was never intended to bestow?

I proceed, therefore, to observe that there is not by far so much unhappiness in the married state in general, as loose authors universally suppose. I choose to state the argument in this manner, because it is much more satisfying than drawing pictures of the extremes on either hand. It signifies very little, on the one hand, to describe the state of a few persons distinguished for understanding, successful in life, respected by the public, and dear to one another; or on the other, those hateful brawls which by and by produce an advertisement in the news-papers, "Whereas Sarah the wife of the subscriber, has eloped "from his bed and board," &c. If we would treat of this matter with propriety, we must consider how it stands among the bulk of mankind. The proposition, then, I mean to establish, is, that there is much less unhappiness in the matrimonial state than is often apprehended, and indeed as much real comfort as there is any ground to expect.

To support this truth, I observe, that taking mankind throughout, we find much more satisfaction and chearfulness in the married than in the single. In proportion to their numbers, I think of those that are grown up to maturer years, or past the meridian of life, there is a much greater degree of peevishness and discontent, whimsical-

neſs and peculiarity, in the laſt than in the firſt. The proſpect of continuing ſingle to the end of life, narrows the mind and cloſes the heart. I knew an inſtance of a gentleman of good eſtate, who lived ſingle till he was paſt forty, and he was eſteemed by all his neighbors not only frugal, but mean in ſome parts of his conduct. This ſame perſon afterwards marrying and having children, every body obſerved that he became liberal and open-hearted on the change, when one would have thought he had a ſtronger motive than before, to ſave and hoard up. On this a neighbor of his made a remark, as a philoſopher, that every ultimate paſſion is ſtronger than an intermediate one; that a ſingle perſon loves wealth immediately, and on its own account; whereas a parent can ſcarcely help preferring his children before it, and valuing it only for their ſakes.

This leads me to obſerve, that marriage muſt be the ſource of happineſs, as being the immediate cauſe of many other relations, the moſt intereſting and delightful. I cannot eaſily figure to myſelf any man who does not look upon it as the firſt of earthly bleſſings, to have children, to be the objects of attachment and care when they are young, and to inherit his name and ſubſtance, when he himſelf muſt, in the courſe of nature, go off the ſtage. Does not this very circumſtance give unſpeakable dignity to each parent in the other's eye, end ſerve to increaſe and confirm that union, which youthful paſſion, and leſs durable motives, firſt occaſioned to take place? I rather chooſe to mention this argument, becauſe neither exalted underſtandings, nor elegance of manners, are neceſſary to give it force. It is felt by the peaſant as well as by the prince; and, if we believe ſome obſervers on human life, its influence is not leſs, but greater in the lower than in the higher ranks.

Before I proceed to any further remarks, I muſt ſay a few words, to prevent or remove a deception, which very probable leads many into error on this ſubject. It is no other than a man's ſuppoſing what would not give him happineſs, cannot give it to another. Becauſe, perhaps, there are few married women, whoſe perſons, converſation,

manners, and conduct, are altogether to his taſte, he takes upon him to conclude, that the huſbands, in theſe numerous inſtances, muſt lead a miſerable life. Is it needful to ſay any thing to ſhow the fallacy of this? The taſtes and diſpoſitions of men are as various as their faces; and therefore what is diſpleaſing to one, may be, not barely tolerable, but agreeable to another. I have known a huſband delighted with his wife's fluency and poignancy of ſpeech in ſcolding her ſervants, and another who was not able to bear the leaſt noiſe of the kind with patience.

Having obviated this miſtake, it will be proper to obſerve, that through all the lower and middle ranks of life, there is generally a good meaſure of matrimonial or domeſtic comfort, when their circumſtances are eaſy, or their eſtate growing. This is eaſily accounted for, not only from their being free from one of the moſt uſual cauſes of peeviſhneſs and diſcontent, but becauſe the affairs of a family are very ſeldom in a thriving ſtate, unleſs both contribute their ſhare of diligence; ſo that they have not only a common happineſs to ſhare, but a joint merit in procuring it. Men may talk in raptures of youth and beauty, wit and ſprightlineſs, and a hundred other ſhining qualities; but after ſeven years cohabitation, not one of them is to be compared to good family management, which is ſeen at every meal, and felt every hour in the huſband's purſe. To this, however, I muſt apply the caution given above.—Such a wife may not appear quite killing to a ſtranger on a viſit. There are a few diſtinguiſhed examples of women of the firſt rate underſtandings, who have all the elegance of court breeding in the parlour, and all the frugality and activity of a farmer's wife in the kitchen; but I have not found this to be the caſe in general. I learned from a certain author many years ago, that "a great care of houſhold affairs generally ſpoils the free, careleſs air of a fine lady;" and I have ſeen no reaſon to diſbelieve it ſince.

Once more, ſo far as I have been able to form a judgment, wherever there is a great and confeſſed ſuperiority of underſtanding on one ſide, with ſome good nature on the other, there is domeſtic peace. It is of little conſe-

quence whether the ſuperiority be on the ſide of the man or woman, provided the ground of it be manifeſt. The fierceſt contentions are generally where the juſt title to command is not quite clear. I am ſenſible I may bring a little ridicule upon myſelf here. It will be alledged that I have clearly eſtabliſhed the right of female authority over that ſpecies of huſbands, known by the name of hen-peckt. But I beg that the nature of my poſition may be attentively conſidered. I have ſaid, "Wherever there is a great and confeſſed ſuperiority of underſtanding. Should not a man comply with reaſon, when offered by his wife, as well as any body elſe? Or ought he to be againſt reaſon, becauſe his wife is for it? I therefore take the liberty of reſcuing from the number of hen-peckt, thoſe who aſk the advice, and follow the direction of their wives in moſt caſes, becauſe they are really better than any they could give themſelves—reſerving thoſe only under the old denomination, who, through fear, are ſubject, not to reaſon, but to paſſion and ill-humor. I ſhall conclude this obſervation with ſaying, for the honour of the female ſex, that I have known a great number of inſtances of juſt and amiable conduct, in caſe of a great inequality of judgment, when the advantage was on the ſide of the woman, than when it was on the ſide of the man. I have known many women of judgment and prudence, who carried it with the higheſt reſpect and decency, to weak and capricious huſbands: But not many men of diſtinguiſhed abilities, who did not betray, if not contempt, at leaſt great indifference, towards weak or trifling wives.

Some other things I had intended to offer upon this ſubject, but as the letter has been drawn out to a greater length than I expected, and they will come in with at leaſt equal propriety under other maxims, I conclude at preſent.

LETTER II.

3. IT is by far the safest and most promising way to marry with a person nearly equal in rank, and perhaps in age; but if there is to be a difference, the risk is much greater when a man marries below his rank, than when a woman descends from hers.

The first part of this maxim has been in substance advanced by many writers, and therefore little will need to be said upon it. I must, however, explain its meaning, which is not always clearly comprehended. By equality in rank, must be understood equality not in fortune, but in education, taste and habits of life. I do not call it inequality, when a gentleman of estate marries a lady who has been from the beginning brought up in the same class of society with himself, and is in every respect as elegant in her sentiments and manners, but by some incidents, that perhaps have lately happened, is unequal to him in point of fortune. I know that from the corrupt and selfish views which prevail so generally in the world, a marriage of this kind is often considered as unequal, and an act of great condescension on the part of the man; but the sentiment is illiberal and unjust. In the same manner, when a lady marries a gentleman of character and capacity, and is in every respect suitable to her, but that his estate is not equal to what she might expect, I do not call it unequal. It is true, parents too frequently prefer circumstances to character, and the female friends of a lady at her own disposal, may say in such a case, that she has made a poor bargain. But taking it still for granted that the fortune only is unequal, I affirm there is nothing in this circumstance that forebodes future dissension, but rather the contrary. An act of generosity never produced a fretful disposition in the person who did it, nor is it reasonable to suppose it will often have that effect on the one who receives it.

The importance, therefore, of equality, arises singly from this circumstance—that there is a great probability,

that the turn, taſte, employments, amuſements, and general carriage of the perſons ſo intimately joined, and ſo frequently together will be mutually agreeable.

The occaſion or motive of firſt entering into the marriage contract, is not of ſo much conſequence to the felicity of the parties, as what they find after they are fairly engaged, and cannot return back. When I viſit a new country, my judgment of it may be influenced a little, but neither much nor long, by flattering hopes or hideous apprehenſions, entertained before actual trial. It has often been ſaid that diſſenſions between married people, generally take their riſe from very inconſiderable circumſtances; to which I will add, that this is moſt commonly the caſe among perſons of ſome ſtation, ſenſe, and breeding. This may ſeem odd, but the difficulty is eaſily ſolved. Perſons of this character have a delicacy on the ſubject of ſo cloſe an union, and expect a ſweetneſs and compliance in matters that would not be minded by the vulgar; ſo that the ſmallneſs of the circumſtance appears in their eye an aggravation of the offence. I have known a gentleman of rank and his lady part for life, by a difference ariſing from a thing ſaid at ſupper, that was not ſo much as obſerved to be an impropriety by three fourths of the company.

This, then, is what I apprehend occaſions the importance of equality in rank. Without this equality, they do not underſtand one another ſufficiently for continual intercourſe.—Many cauſes of difference will ariſe, not only ſudden and unexpected, but impoſſible to be foreſeen, and therefore not provided againſt. I muſt alſo obſerve, that an explication or expoſtulation, in the caſes here in view, is more tedious and difficult than any other —perhaps more dangerous and uncertain in the iſſue. How ſhall the one attempt to convince the other of an incongruity of behaviour, in what all their former ideas have taught them to believe as innocent or decent, ſometimes even laudable? The attempt is often conſidered as an inſult on their former ſtation, and inſtead of producing concord, lays the foundation of continual ſolicitude, or increaſing averſion. A man may be guilty of ſpeaking

very unadvisedly through intemperate rage, or may perhaps come home flustered with liquor, and his wife, if prudent, may find a season for mentioning them, when the admonition will be received with calmness, and followed by reformation; but if she discovers her displeasure at rusticity of carriage, or meanness of sentiment, I think there is little hope that it will have any effect that is good. The habit cannot be mended; yet he may have sagacity enough to see that the wife of his bosom has despised him in her heart.

I am going to put a case. Suppose that the late ——, who acquired so vast an estate, had married a lady of the first rank, education, and taste, and that she had learned a few anecdotes of his public speeches—that he spoke of *this here* report of *that there* committee—or of a man's being *drowned* on the coast of the *Island* of Pennsylvania. Now, I desire to know how she could help pouting, and being a little out of humor, especially if he came home full of inward satisfaction, and was honestly of opinion that he spoke *equally* as *well* as any other in the house? That things may be fairly balanced, I will put another case. Suppose a gentleman of rank, literature, and taste, has married a tradesman's daughter for the sake of fortune, or from desire, which he calls love, kindled by an accidental glance of a fresh-colored young woman: Suppose her never to have had the opportunity of being in what the world calls good company, and in consequence to be wholly ignorant of the modes that prevail there; Suppose, at the same time, that her understanding has never been enlarged by reading, or conversation. In such a case, how soon must passion be fated, and what innumerable causes of shame and mortification must every day produce? I am not certain whether the difficulty will be greater, if she continues the manners of her former, or attempts to put on those of her present station. If any man thinks that he can easily preserve the esteem and attention due to a wife in such circumstances, he will probably be mistaken, and no less so if he expects to communicate refinement by a few lessons, or prevent misbehavior by fretfulness, or peevish and satirical remarks.

But let me come now to the latter part of the maxim, which I do not remember to have ever met with in any author—that there is a much greater risk when a man marries below his rank, than when a woman marries below her's. As to the matter of fact, it depends entirely on the justness and accuracy of my observations, of which every reader must be left to judge for himself. I must, however, take notice, that when I speak of a woman marrying below her station, I have no view at all to include what there have been some examples of—a gentleman's daughter running away with her father's footman, or a lady of quality with a player, this is, in every instance, an act of pure lasciviousness, and is, without any exception that ever I heard of followed by immediate shame and future beggary.—It has not, however, any more connexion with marriage, than the transactions of a brothel, or the memoirs of a kept mistress. The truth is, elopements in general are things of an eccentric nature: And when I hear of one, I seldom make any further enquiry after the felicity of the parties. But when marriages are contracted with any degree of deliberation, if there be a difference in point of rank, I think it is much better the advantage should be on the woman's side than on the man's: that is to say, marriages of the first kind are usually more happy than the other.

Supposing, therefore, the fact to be as now stated, what remains for me is, to investigate a little the causes of it, and pointed out those circumstances in human tempers and characters, or in the state of society, which give us reason to expect that it will, in most cases turn out so. Whenever any effect is general, in the moral as well as natural world, there must be some permanent cause, or causes, sufficient to account for it. Shall we assign as one reason for it, that there is, taking them complexly, more of real virtue and commanding principle in the female sex than in the male, which makes them, upon the whole, act a better part in the married relation? I will not undertake to prove this opinion to be true, and far less will I attempt to refute it, or show it to be false. Many authors of great penetration have affirmed it;

and doubtleſs taking virtue to be the ſame thing with ſound faith and good morals, much may be ſaid in its favor. But there does not appear to me ſo great a ſuperiority in this reſpect, as fully to account for the effect in queſtion. Beſides, the advantages which men have in point of knowledge, from the uſual courſe of education, may perhaps balance the ſuperiority of women, in point of virtue; for none ſurely can deny, that matrimonial diſcord may not ariſe from ignorance and folly, as well as vice. Allowing, therefore, as much influence to this cauſe, as every one from his experience and obſervation may think its due, I beg leave to ſuggeſt ſome other things which certainly do co-operate with it, and augment its force.

1. It is much eaſier, in moſt caſes, for a man to improve or riſe after marriage to a more elegant taſte in life than a woman. I do not attribute this in the leaſt to ſuperior natural talents, but to the more frequent opportunities he has of ſeeing the world, and converſing with perſons of different ranks. There is no inſtance in which the ſphere of buſineſs and converſation is not more extenſive to the huſband than the wife; and therefore if a man is married to one of taſte ſuperior to his own, he may draw gradually nearer to her, though ſhe deſcend very little. I think I can recollect more inſtances than one of a man in buſineſs married at firſt to his equal, and, on a ſecond marriage, to one of higher breeding, when not only the houſe and family, but the man himſelf, was ſpedily in a very different ſtyle. I can alſo recollect inſtances in which married perſons roſe together to an opulent eſtate from almoſt nothing, and the man improved conſiderably in politeneſs, or fitneſs for public life, but the woman not at all. The old goſſips and the old converſation continued to the very laſt. It is not even without example, that a plain woman, raiſed by the ſucceſs of her huſband, becomes impatient of the ſociety forced upon her, takes refuge in the kitchen, and ſpends moſt of her agreeable hours with her ſervants, from whom, indeed, ſhe differs nothing but in name. A certain perſon in a trading city in Great-Britaian, from being merely a

mechanic, turned dealer, and in a courſe of years acquired an immenſe fortune. He had a ſtrong deſire that his family ſhould make a figure, and ſpared no expence in purchaſing velvets, ſilks, laces, &c. but at laſt he found that it was loſt labor, and ſaid very truly, that all the money in Great-Britain would not make his wife and his daughters *ladies*.

2. When a woman marries below her rank, I think it is, generally ſpeaking, upon better motives than when a man marries below his, and therefore no wonder that it ſhould be attended with greater comfort. I find it aſſerted in ſeveral papers of the Spectator, and I think it muſt be admitted by every impartial obſerver, that women are not half ſo much governed, in their love attachments, by beauty, or outward form, as men. A man of a very mean figure, if he has any talents, joined to a tolerable power of ſpeech, will often make him acceptable to a very lovely woman. It is alſo generally thought that a woman rates a man pretty much according to the eſteem he is held in by his own ſex: if this is the caſe, it is to be preſumed that when a man ſucceeds in his addreſſes to a lady of higher breeding than his own, he is not altogether void of merit, and therefore will not in the iſſue diſgrace her choice.—This will be confirmed by reflecting that many ſuch marriages muſt be with perſons of the learned profeſſions, it is paſt a doubt that literature refines as well as enlarges the mind, and generally renders a man capable of appearing with tolerable dignity, whatever have been the place or circumſtances of his birth. It is eaſy to ſee that the reverſe of all this muſt happen upon the other ſuppoſition: When a man marries below his rank, the very beſt motive to which it can be attributed, is an admiration of her beauty. Good ſenſe, and other more valuable qualities are not eaſily ſeen under the diſguiſe of low breeding, and when they are ſeen, have ſeldom juſtice done them. Now as beauty is much more fading than life, and fades ſooner in a huſband's eye than any other, in a little time nothing will remain but what tends to create uneaſineſs and diſguſt.

3. The poſſeſſion of the graces, or taſte and elegance of manners, is a much more important part of a female than

a male character. Nature has given a much greater degree of beauty and ſweetneſs to the outward form of women than of men, and has by that means pointed out wherein their ſeveral excellencies ſhould conſiſt. From this, in conjunction with the former obſervation, it is manifeſt, that the man who finds in his wife a remarkable defect in point of politeneſs, or the art of pleaſing, will be much more diſappointed than the woman who finds a like defect in her huſband. Many do not form any expectation of refinement in their huſbands, even before marriage: not a few, if I am not much miſtaken, are rather pleaſed than otherwiſe, to think that any who enters the houſe, perceives the difference between the elegance of the wife, and the plainneſs, not to ſay the aukwardneſs of the huſband. I have obſerved this, even down to the loweſt rank. A tradeſman or country farmer's wife will ſometimes abuſe and ſcold her huſband for want of order or cleanlineſs, and there is no mark of inward malice or ill-humor in that ſcolding, becauſe ſhe is ſenſible it is her proper province to be accurate in that matter. I think alſo, that the huſband in ſuch caſes is often gratified inſtead of being offended, becauſe it pleaſes him to think that he has a wife that does juſt as ſhe ought to do. But take the thing the other way, and there is no rank of life, from the prince to the peaſant, in which the huſband can take pleaſure in a wife more aukward or more ſlovenly than himſelf.

To ſum up the whole, if ſome conformity or ſimilarity of manners is of the utmoſt conſequence to matrimonial comfort—if taſte and elegance are of more conſequence to the wife than the huſband, according to their ſtation: —and, if it is more difficult for her to acquire it after marriage, if ſhe does not poſſeſs it before—I humbly conceive I have fully ſupported my propoſition, that there is a much greater riſk in a man's marrying below his ſtation, than a woman's deſcending from her's.

LETTER III.

I HAVE not yet done with the maxims on matrimonial happineſs; therefore obſerve,

4. That it is not by far of ſo much conſequence, what are the talents, temper, turn of mind, character, or circumſtances of both or either of the parties, as that there be a certain ſuitableneſs or correſpondence of thoſe of the one to thoſe of the other.

Thoſe eſſay writers, who have taken human nature and life as their great general ſubject, have many remarks on the cauſes of infelicity in the marriage union, as well as many beautiful and ſtriking pictures of what would be juſt, generous, prudent, and dutiful conduct, or their contraries, in particular circumſtances. Great pains have been taken alſo to point out what ought to be the motives of choice to both parties, if they expect happineſs. Without entering into a full detail of what has been ſaid upon this ſubject, I think the two chief competitors for preference, have generally been—good nature and good ſenſe. The advocates for the firſt ſay, that as the happineſs of married people muſt ariſe from a continual interchange of kind offices, and from a number of ſmall circumſtances, that occur every hour, a gentle and eaſy diſpoſition—a temper that is happy in itſelf—muſt be the cauſe of happineſs to another. The advocates for good ſenſe ſay, that the ſweetneſs of good nature is only for the honey-moon; that it will either change its nature, and become ſour by long-ſtanding, or become wholly inſipid; ſo that if it do not generate hatred, it will at leaſt incur indifference or contempt; whereas good ſenſe is a ſterling quality, which cannot fail to produce and preſerve eſteem—the true foundation of rational love.

If I may, as I believe moſt people do, take the prevailing ſentiments within the compaſs of my own reading and converſation, for the general opinion, I think it is in favour of good ſenſe. And if we muſt determine between theſe two, and decide which of them is of the

moſt importance when ſeparated from the other, I have very little to ſay againſt the public judgment. But in this, as in many other caſes, it is only imperfect and general, and often ill underſtood and falſely applied. There is hardly a more noted ſaying than that a man of ſenſe will never uſe a woman ill, which is true or falſe according to the meaning that is put upon the phraſe, *using a woman ill.* If it be meant, that he will not ſo probably beat his wife, as a fool; that he will not ſcold or curſe her, or treat her with ill manners before company, or indeed that he will not ſo probably keep a continual wrangling, either in public or private, I admit that it is true. Good ſenſe is the beſt ſecurity againſt indecorums of every kind. But if it be meant, that a man will not make his wife in any caſe truly miſerable, I utterly deny it. On the contrary, there are many inſtances in which men make uſe of their ſenſe itſelf, their judgment, penetration, and knowledge of human life, to make their wives more exquiſitely unhappy. What ſhall we ſay of thoſe, who can ſting them with reflections ſo artfully guarded that it is impoſſible not to feel them, and yet almoſt as impoſſible with propriety to complain of them?

I muſt alſo obſerve, that a high degree of delicacy in ſentiment, although this is the prevailing ingredient when men attempt to paint refined felicity in the married ſtate, is one of the moſt dangerous qualities that can be mentioned. It is like certain medicines that are powerful in their operation, but at the ſame time require the utmoſt caution and prudence, as to the time and manner of their being applied.—A man or woman of extreme delicacy is a delightful companion for a viſit or a day. But there are many characters which I would greatly prefer in a partner, or a child, or other near relation, in whoſe permanent happineſs I felt myſelf deeply concerned. I hope no-body will think me ſo clowniſh as to exclude ſentiment altogether. I have declared my opinion upon this ſubject, and alſo my deſire that the woman ſhould be the more refined of the two. But I adhere to it, that carrying this matter to an extreme is of the moſt dangerous conſequence. Your high ſentimentaliſts form expectations

which it is impoſſible to gratify. The gallantry of courtſhip, and the *bienseance* of general converſation in the *beau monde*, ſeem to promiſe what the downright reality of matrimony cannot afford.

I will here relate a caſe that fell within my obſervation. A perſon of noble birth had been ſome years married to a merchant's daughter of immenſe fortune, by which his eſtate had been ſaved from ruin. Her education had been as good as money could make it, from her infancy: ſo that ſhe knew every mode of high life as well as he. They were upon a viſit to a family of equal rank, intimately connected with the author of this letter. The manner of the man was diſtinguiſhed and exemplary. His behavior to his lady was with the moſt perfect delicacy. He ſpoke to her as often as to any other, and treated her not only with the ſame complacency, but with the ſame decency and reſerve, that he did other ladies. To this he added the moſt tender ſolicitude about her not taking cold, about her place in the chamber, and her covering when going abroad, &c. &c. After their departure, the whole family they had left excepting one, were two or three days expatiating on the beauty of his behavior. One lady in particular ſaid at laſt, "Oh! how happy a married woman have I ſeen." The ſingle diſſenter, who was an elderly woman, then ſaid, "Well; you may be right; but I am of a different opinion, I do not like ſo perfect and finiſhed a ceremonial between perſons who have been married five or ſix years at leaſt. I obſerved that he did every thing that he ought to have done, and likewiſe that ſhe received his civilities with much dignity and good manners, but with great gravity. I would rather have ſeen him leſs punctual and her more cheerful. If, therefore, that lady is as happy in her heart, as you ſuppoſe I am miſtaken; that is all. But if I were to make a bet upon it, I would bet as much up the tradeſman and his wife, according to the common deſcription, walking to church, the one three or four yards before the other, and never looking back." What did time diſcover? That nobleman and his lady parted within two years, and never reunited.

Let me now eſtabliſh my maxim, that it is not the fine qualites of both or either party that will inſure happineſs, but that the one be ſuitable to the other. By their being ſuitable, is not to be underſtood their being both of the ſame turn ; but that the defects of the one be ſupplied or ſubmitted to by ſome correſpondent quality of the other. I think I have ſeen many inſtances, in which gravity, ſeverity, and even moroſeneſs in a huſband, where there has been virtue at bottom, has been ſo tempered with meekneſs, gentleneſs and compliance in the wife, as has produced real and laſting comfort to both. I have alſo ſeen ſome inſtances, in which fourneſs, and want of female ſoftneſs in a woman, has been ſo happily compenſated by eaſineſs and good humor in a huſband, that no appearance of wrangling or hatred was to be ſeen in a whole life. I have ſeen multitudes of inſtances, in which vulgarity, and even liberal freedom, not far from brutality in a huſband, has been borne with perfect patience and ſerenity by a wife, who, by long cuſtom, had become, as it were, inſenſible of the impropriety, and yet never inattentive to her own behavior.

As a farther illuſtration, I will relate two or three caſes from real life, which have appeared to me the moſt ſingular in my experience. I ſpent ſome time, many years ago, in the neighborhood of, and frequent intercourſe with, a huſband and his wife in the following ſtate. She was not handſome, and at the ſame time was valetudinary, fretful and peeviſh— conſtantly talking of her ailments, diſſatisfied with every thing about her, and, what appeared moſt ſurpriſing, ſhe vented theſe complaints moſt when her huſband was preſent. He, on the other hand, was moſt affectionate and ſympathiſing, conſtantly upon the watch for any thing that could gratify her deſires, or alleviate her diſtreſſes. The appearance for a while ſurprized me, and I thought he led the life of a ſlave. But at laſt I diſcovered that there are two ways of complaining, not ſuddenly diſtinguiſhable to common obſervers : The one is an expreſſion of confidence, and the other of diſcontent. When a woman opens all her complaints to her huſband, in full confidence that he will ſympathize with her, and

ſeeking the relief which ſuch ſympathy affords, taking care to keep to the proportion which experience hath taught her will not be diſagreeable to him, it frequently increaſes inſtead of extinguiſhing affection.

Take another caſe as follows: Syriſca was a young woman the reverſe of beauty. She got her living in a trading city, by keeping a ſmall ſhop, not of the millinary kind, which is nearly allied to elegance and high life, but of common grocery goods, ſo that the poor were her chief cuſtomers.

By the death of a brother in the Eaſt-Indies, ſhe came ſuddenly and unexpectedly to a fortune of many thouſand pounds. The moment this was known, a knight's lady in the neighborhood deſtined Syriſca as a prize for Horatio, her own brother, of the military profeſſion, on half pay, and rather paſt the middle of life. For this purpoſe ſhe made her a viſit, carried her to her houſe, aſſiſted, no doubt, in bringing home and properly ſecuring her fortune; and in as ſhort a time as could well be expected, completed her purpoſe. They lived together on an eſtate in the country, often viſited by the great relations of the huſband. Syriſca was good natured and talkative, and therefore often betrayed the meanneſs of her birth and education, but was not ſenſible of it. Good-will ſupplied the place of good breeding with her, and ſhe did not know the difference. Horatio had generoſity and good ſenſe, treated her with the greateſt tenderneſs, and having a great fund of facetiouſneſs and good humor, acquired a happy talent of giving a lively or ſprightly turn to every thing ſaid by his wife, or diverting the attention of the company to other ſubjects. The reader will probably ſay, he took the way that was pointed out by reaſon and was moſt conducive to his own comfort. I ſay ſo too; but at the ſame time affirm, that there are multitudes who could not, or would not have followed his example.

I give one piece of hiſtory more, but with ſome fear, that nice readers will be offended, and call it a caricature. However, let it go. Agreſtis was a gentleman of an ancient family, but the eſtate was almoſt gone; little more of it remained but what he farmed himſelf, and indeed

his habitation did not differ from that of a farmer, but by having an old tower and battlements. He had either received no education, or had been incapable of profiting by it, for he was the moſt illiterate perſon I ever knew, who kept any company. His converſation did not riſe even to politics, for he found ſuch inſuperable difficulty in pronouncing the names of generals, admirals, countries, and cities, conſtantly occurring in the newſpapers, that he was obliged to give them up altogether. Of ploughs, waggons, cows, and horſes, he knew as much as moſt men: What related to theſe, with the prices of grain, and the news of births and marriages in the pariſh and neighborhood, completed the circle of his converſation.

About the age of forty he married Lenia, a young woman of a family equal to him in rank, but ſomewhat ſuperior in wealth. She knew a little more of the ſtrain of faſhionable converſation, and not a whit more of any thing elſe. She was a ſlattern in her perſon, and of conſequence there was neither cleanlineſs nor order in the family. They had many children; ſhe bore him twins twice—a circumſtance of which he was very proud, and frequently boaſted of it in a manner not over delicate to thoſe who had not been ſo fortunate in that particular. They were both good natured and hoſpitable; if a ſtranger came he was made heartily welcome, though ſometimes a little incommoded by an uproar among the children and the dogs, when ſtriving about the fire in a cold day; the noiſe was, however, little leſs diſſonant than the clamors of Agreſtis himſelf, when rebuking the one, or chaſtening the other, out of complaiſance to his gueſts. The couple lived many years in the moſt perfect amity by their being perfectly ſuitable the one to the other, and I am confident not a woman envied the wife, nor a man the huſband, while the union laſted.

It is very eaſy to ſee from theſe examples, the vaſt importance of the temper and manner of the one, being truly ſuitable to thoſe of the other. If I had not given hiſtories enough already, I could mention ſome in which each party I think could have made ſome other man or woman perfectly happy, and yet they never could arrive at hap-

pineſs, or indeed be at peace with one another. Certainly, therefore, this ſhould be an object particularly attended to in courtſhips, or while marriage is on the *tapis*, as politicians ſay.

If I look out for a wife, I ought to conſider, not whether a lady has fine qualities for which ſhe ought to be eſteemed or admired, or whether ſhe has ſuch a deportment as I will take particular delight in, and ſuch a taſte as gives reaſon to think ſhe will take delight in me; I may pitch too high, as well as too low, and the iſſue may be equally unfortunate. Perhaps I ſhall be told there lies the great difficulty. How ſhall we make this diſcovery? In time of youth and courtſhip, there is ſo much ſtudied attention to pleaſe, from intereſted views, and ſo much reſtraint from faſhion and the obſervation of others, that it is hard to judge how they will turn out afterwards.

This I confeſs to be a conſiderable difficulty, and at the ſame time greateſt upon the man's ſide. The man being generally the eldeſt, his character, temper and habits may be more certainly known.—Whereas there are ſometimes great diſappointments on the other ſide, and that happily both ways. I am able juſt now to recollect one or two inſtances of giddy and fooliſh, nay, of idle, lazy, drowſy girls, who, after marriage, felt themſelves intereſted, and became as ſpirited and active heads of families, as any whatever, and alſo ſome of the moſt elegant and exemplary, who, after marriage, fell into a languid ſtupidity, and contracted habits of the moſt odious and diſguſtful kind. Theſe inſtances, however are rare, and thoſe who will take the pains to examine, may in general obtain ſatisfaction. It is alſo proper to obſerve, that if a man finds it difficult to judge of the temper and character of a woman, he has a great advantage on his ſide, that the right of ſelection belongs to him. He may aſk any woman he pleaſes, after the moſt mature deliberation, and need aſk no other; whereas a woman muſt make the beſt choice ſhe can, of thoſe only who do or probably will aſk her. But with theſe reflections in our view, what ſhall we ſay of the inconceivable folly of thoſe, who, in time of courtſhip, are every now and then taking things in high dudgeon, and ſometimes very great ſubmiſſions are neceſſary

to make up the breaches? If such persons marry, and do not agree, shall we pity them? I think not. After the most serene courtship, there may possibly be a rough enough passage through life; but after a courtship of storms, to expect a marriage of calm weather, is certainly more than common presumption; therefore they ought to take the consequences.

On the whole, I think that the calamities of the married state are generally to be imputed to the persons themselves in the following proportion:—Three-fourths to the man, for want of care and judgment in the choice, and one-fourth to the woman on the same score. Suppose a man had bought a farm, and after a year or two, should, in conversation with his neighbor, make heavy complaints how much he had been disappointed, I imagine his friend might say to him, did you not see this land before you bought it? O yes, I saw it often. Do you not understand soils? I think I do tolerably. Did you not examine it with care? Not so much as I should have done; standing at a certain place, it looked admirably well; the fences too were new, and looked exceedingly neat; the house had been just painted a stone colour, with pannelling; the windows were large and elegant; but I neglected entirely to examine the sufficiency of the materials, or the disposition of the apartments. There were in the month of April two beautiful springs, but since I have lived here they have been dry every year before the middle of June. Did you not inquire of those who had lived on the place of the permanency of the springs? No, indeed, I omitted it. Had you the full measure you were promised? Yes, every acre.—Was the right complete and valid? Yes, yes, perfectly good: no man in America can take it from me. Were you obliged to take it up in part of a bad debt? No, nothing like it. I took such a fancy for it all at once, that I pestered the man from week to week to let me have it. Why really then, says his friend, I think you had better keep your complaints to yourself. Cursing and fretfulness will never turn stones into earth, or sand into loam; but I can assure you, that frugality, industry, and good culture, will make a bad farm very tolerable and an indifferent one truly good.

ADDRESS

TO THE

Inhabitants of Jamaica, and other West-India Islands,

in behalf of the College of New-Jersey.

GENTLEMEN,

IT is unneceſſary to begin this addreſs by a labored encomium on learning in general, or the importance of public ſeminaries for the inſtruction of youth. Their uſe in every country; their neceſſity in a new or riſing country; and, particularly the influence of Science, in giving a proper direction and full force to induſtry or enterprize, are indeed ſo manifeſt, that they are either admitted by all, or the exceptions are ſo few as to be wholly unworthy of regard.

In a more private view, the importance of education is little leſs evident. It promotes virtue and happineſs, as well as arts and induſtry. On this, as on the former, it is unneceſſary to enlarge; only ſuffer me to make a remark, not quite ſo common, that, if there is any juſt compariſon on this ſubject, the children of perſons in the higher ranks of life, and, eſpecially, of thoſe who by their own activity and diligence riſe to opulence, have of all others the greateſt need of an early, prudent, and well-conducted education. The wealth to which they are born becomes often a dangerous temptation, and the ſtation in which they enter upon life requires ſuch duties, as thoſe of the

fineſt talents can ſcarcely be ſuppoſed capable of, unleſs they have been improved and cultivated with the utmoſt care. Experience ſhews the uſe of a liberal education in both theſe views. It is generally a preſervative from vices of a certain claſs, by giving eaſy acceſs to more refined pleaſures, and inſpiring the mind with an abhorrence of low riot, and contempt for brutal converſation. It is alſo of acknowledged neceſſity to thoſe who do not wiſh to live for themſelves alone, but would apply their talents to the ſervice of the public and the good of mankind. Education is therefore of equal importance in order either to enjoy life with dignity and elegance, or employ it to the benefit of ſociety in offices of power or truſt.

But leaving theſe general topics, or rather, taking it for granted that every thing of this kind is by intelligent perſons, eſpecially parents, both believed and felt; I proceed to inform the public that it is intended to ſolicit benefactions from the wealthy and generous, in behalf of a College of conſiderable ſtanding, founded at NASSAU-HALL, in *Princeton*, *New-Jerſey*. In order to this it is neceſſary for me—1. To ſhew the great advantage it will be to the inhabitants of the Weſt-Indies, to have it in their power to ſend their children to approved places of education on the continent of America, inſtead of being obliged to ſend them over, for the very elements of ſcience, to South or North Britain. 2. To point out the ſituation and advantages of the College of New-Jerſey in particular. And as I was never a lover either of florid diſcourſe, or oſtentatious promiſes, I ſhall endeavor to handle theſe two points with all poſſible ſimplicity, and with that reſerve and decency which are ſo neceſſary, where compariſon in ſome reſpects cannot be avoided.

On the firſt of theſe points, let it be obſerved,

That places of education on the continent of America are much nearer to the Weſt-Indies than thoſe in Great-Britain; and yet ſufficiently diſtant to remove the temptation of running home and lurking in idleneſs. This is a circumſtance, which, other things being ſuppoſed equal, is by no means inconſiderable. Parents may hear much oftener from and of their children, and may even viſit

them, as is known to have been the case here, with no great loss of time for business, and to the advantage of their own health. They may also much more speedily and certainly be informed, whether they are profiting and have justice done them or not, and remove or continue them at pleasure. The distance indeed is, if I mistake not, well proportioned in all respects. It is such as to allow of the advantages just now mentioned, and yet so great as to favor the behaviour and instruction of the youth. I have observed in the course of four years experience, that those who came from the greatest distance have, in general, behaved with most regularity. Being removed from their relations, it becomes necessary for them to support a character, as they find themselves treated by their companions, teachers, and indeed all other persons, according to their behavior. This is so true, that if parents are obliged to place their children out of their own families, an hundred miles distance is better than twenty, and so of every other proportion till we come to the hurtful extreme.

Let it be further observed, that the climate of the continent of North-America is certainly much more healthy in itself, and probably also more suited to the constitutions of those who have been born in the West-Indies, than that of Great-Britain. Health is the foundation of every earthly blessing, and absolutely necessary both to the receiving instruction in youth, and being able in riper years to apply it to its proper use. Parental tenderness will make every one feel the importance of this to his own children. And whether the observation itself is just or not, I leave to be decided by the judgment of all who have been in both countries, and the information they will readily give to those who have not.

Having touched on these circumstances, let us try to make the comparison as to the substance of the education itself. Here, I am sensible it behoves me to write with the utmost circumspection to avoid giving offence, and that to some this will appear, at first sight, altogether impossible. I am however not without the greatest hopes, that I shall be able fully to prove the proposition I have

laid down, without giving any juſt ground of offence to perſons of reflection and candor. No man can have a higher opinion of, and not many have a more thorough acquaintance with, the means of Education, at preſent, in Great Britain, than the author of this addreſs, who was born in the neighbourhood of Edinburgh, educated in it, and ſpent the greateſt part of his after-life in conſtant intercourſe and great intimacy with the members of the Univerſity of Glaſgow. He therefore ſays it, both with pleaſure and gratitude, that any young gentleman, who is ſtrictly ſober in his behavior, and who applies with ſteadineſs and diligence, has all poſſible advantages, particularly in North-Britain, with which he is beſt acquainted, for improving himſelf in claſſic literature, in every branch of ſcience, and eſpecially in the juſtly valued knowledge of the force and propriety of the Engliſh language, and in true taſte, including all that is uſually comprehended under the general expreſſion of the Belles Lettres. Nay, further, he admits and affirms, that any gentleman of fortune, who would give the laſt and higheſt poliſh to the education of a young man of promiſing parts, would do well to ſend him, after his principles are fixed, and his judgment a little matured, for a year or two, to ſome of the Univerſities of Great-Britain. But notwithſtanding theſe conceſſions, if they may be ſo called, it is hoped it will appear, that it would be much more to the advantage of the gentlemen of the Weſt-Indies to give their children their grammar-ſchool and college education, at leaſt to their firſt degree in the arts, in an American ſeminary, if conducted by perſons of ability and integrity, than to ſend them to Great Britain; and that for two important reaſons; firſt, the better to ſecure their inſtruction, and ſecondly, for the preſervation of their morals.

1. For the greater ſecurity of their inſtruction. The colleges in Britain have by no means that forcible motive that we have, not only to teach thoſe who are willing to learn, but to ſee that every one be obliged to ſtudy, and actually learn, in proportion to his capacity. Theſe old foundations have ſtood ſo many ages, have had their character ſo long eſtabliſhed, and are indeed, ſo well known

to be filled with men of the greateſt ability, that they do not ſo much as feel any injury, in point of reputation, from one or more coming out of college almoſt as ignorant as they went in. The truth is, I do not think they ought to loſe any character by it. Every one knows, that it is owing to the idleneſs or profligacy of the boy, and not the inſufficiency of the maſter. When the numbers of one claſs are from an hundred to an hundred and thirty, or perhaps more, and when they do not live in College, how is it poſſible the maſter can keep them to their private ſtudies, or even with any certainty diſcern whether they ſtudy diligently or not. A good profeſſor is eaſily and ſpeedily diſtinguiſhed by his own performances, by the eſteem, attachment, and progreſs of the diligent, but very little, if at all, hurt by the ignorance of the negligent. I write theſe things to vaſt numbers who know them as well as I do; and I could eaſily produce gentlemen in America, who have freely and generouſly confeſſed themſelves to be unhappy proofs of their truth. Let not any body ſay I reflect upon the teachers for not uſing diſcipline to oblige them to apply. The numbers are ſo great, that to try and judge every neglect, would take more time than they have for their whole work. To this may be added, that it may very often happen that the perſons to whoſe charge boys in early life are ſent from the Weſt-Indies, either are not themſelves judges, or, from their ſituation and buſineſs, have few opportunities of knowing whether they profit or not.

On the other hand, the young ſeminaries in America have their character conſtantly at ſtake for their diligence, as one or two untaught coming out from us, affects us in the moſt ſenſible manner. As to the College of New-Jerſey in particular, we have ſeen the importance of this in ſo ſtrong a light, that whereas before we had half-yearly, we now have quarterly examinations, carried on with the utmoſt ſtrictneſs, when all who are found deficient are degraded to the inferior claſs. So impartially have theſe trials been conducted, that nothing is more uſual than for thoſe who ſuſpect themſelves, eſpecially, if their relations are near, to pretend ſickneſs and avoid the examination,

that they may afterwards fall back without the diſhonor of a ſentence. Further, all the ſcholars with us, as ſoon as they put on the gown, are obliged to lodge in college, and muſt of neceſſity be in their chamber in ſtudy-hours: nor is it in the leaſt difficult to diſcover whether they apply carefully or not. The teachers alſo live in college, ſo that they have every poſſible advantage; not only for aſſiſting the diligent but ſtimulating the ſlothful.

2. The ſecond reaſon for preferring an American education is, that their morals may be more effectually preſerved. This, by all virtuous and judicious parents, will be held a point of the laſt conſequence. The danger they run of contracting vicious habits by being ſent to Britain, has been often complained of, and therefore, I ſuppoſe, is matter of experience. If ſo, it will not be difficult to aſſign the cauſes of it, which may be ſafely mentioned, becauſe they carry no imputation upon the ſchools or colleges to which they are ſent. They generally are, and are always ſuppoſed to be, of great wealth. The very name of a Weſt-Indian, has come to imply in it great opulence. Now it is well known that, in all the great towns in Britain, a ſet of profligate boys, and ſometimes artful perſons farther advanced in life, attach themſelves to ſuch as are well ſupplied with money, impoſe upon their youth and ſimplicity, gratify them in every irregular deſire, and lead them both into idleneſs and vice. There are alſo in every conſiderable place in Great Britain, but eſpecially the principal cities where the colleges are fixed, a conſtant ſucceſſion and variety of intoxicating diverſions, ſuch as balls, concerts, plays, races, and others. Theſe, whatever may be pleaded for ſome of them in a certain meaſure for thoſe further advanced, every body muſt acknowledge, are highly pernicious to youth in the firſt ſtages of their education. The temptation becomes ſo much the ſtronger, and indeed almoſt irreſiſtible, when an acquaintance with theſe things is conſidered as faſhionable life, and neceſſary to the accompliſhment of a man of breeding. Is it to be ſuppoſed that young perſons of great fortune, when they can be immediate partakers, will wait with patience for the proper time when they may be permitted to view with

caution such scenes of dissipation? On the contrary it may be expected, that they will give into them with all the impetuosity and rashness of youth; and, when their parents expect them to return well stored with classic learning and philosophy, they may find them only well acquainted with the laws of the turf or gaming-table, and expert in the use of the reigning phrases of those honorable arts.

What provision is made for preserving and improving the morals of the scholars with us, I leave till I come to speak of the constitution and situation of the College of New-Jersey. But before I dismiss this part of the subject I must just repeat, that the two reasons I have given against a British education do, and were intended only to conclude against sending boys in early life. At that time they are incapable of reaping the advantages chiefly to be valued in a British education. These are not only hearing and being able to judge of the public performances of men of letters, in the pulpit, at the bar, and in parliament; but being introduced to the acquaintance and enjoying the conversation of men of eminence. This is a favor that would not be granted to boys, and if granted could be of no service, but contributes in the highest degree to the delight and instruction of those of riper years. Experience seems greatly to confirm this, for, as many boys have left some of the best schools in Britain with little classic knowledge, though supported at great expence, so those who received their first education in this country, and went home to finish it, have seldom returned without great and real improvement.

In addition to these arguments in behalf of American colleges, drawn from the instruction and morals of the youth who are sent to them, I cannot help mentioning one other which must have great weight in a view somewhat different. These colleges must necessarily, in time, produce a number of young men proper to undertake the office of private tutors in gentlemen's families. There are some who prefer a private to a public education at any rate, especially in the very first stages, and some find it necessary, as not being able to support the expence of

ſending their children ſo early, and keeping them ſo long from home. Now all who know the ſituation of things in Britain, muſt be ſenſible how difficult it is to get young men of capacity or expectation, to leave their native country in order to undertake the inſtruction of gentlemen's children. In this office there is little proſpect of increaſe of fortune, to balance the riſk of going to a new and dangerous, or ſuppoſed dangerous, climate. But thoſe who are born and educated in America will not only increaſe the number of ſuch teachers, but they will have no ſuch hideous apprehenſions of going to any part of the continent or iſlands. Whatever is done, therefore, to raiſe and ſupport proper ſeminaries in America, will, in time, be followed by this great and general benefit, which I have been aſſured is very much needed in many or moſt of the Weſt-India iſlands.

I will now proceed to ſpeak a little of the Conſtitution and Advantages of the College of New-Jerſey in particular.

About twenty-four years ago, ſeveral gentlemen and miniſters in this province, by the friendſhip and patronage of Jonathan Belcher, Eſq. then Governor, obtained a very ample royal charter, incorporating them under the title of Truſtees of the College of New-Jerſey; and giving them the ſame privileges and powers that are given to the 'two Engliſh Univerſities, or any other Univerſity or 'College in Great-Britain.' They, although only poſſeſſed of a naked charter, without any public encouragement, immediately began the inſtruction; and very ſoon after, by their own activity and zeal, and the benevolence of others who had the higheſt opinion of their integrity, raiſed a noble building, called Naſſau-Hall, at princeton, New-Jerſey. This they choſe to do, though it waſted their capital, as their great intention was to make effectual proviſion, not only for the careful inſtruction, but for the regular government of the youth. There all the ſcholars are lodged, and alſo boarded, except when they have expreſs licenſe to board out, in the preſident's houſe or elſewhere.

The regular courſe of inſtruction is in four claſſes, exactly after the manner, and bearing the names of the claſſes in the Engliſh univerſities; Freſhman, Sophomore, Junior and Senior. In the firſt year, they read Latin and Greek, with the Roman and Grecian antiquities, and rhetoric. In the ſecond continuing the ſtudy of the languages, they learn a complete ſyſtem of geography, with the uſe of the globes, the firſt principles of philoſophy, and the elements of mathematical knowledge. The third, though the languages are not wholly omitted, is chiefly employed in mathematics and natural Philoſophy. And the ſenior year is employed in reading the higher claſſics, proceeding in the mathematics and natural philoſophy, and going through a courſe of moral philoſophy. In addition to theſe, the Preſident gives lectures to the juniors and ſeniors, which conſequently every ſtudent hears twice over in his courſe, firſt upon chronology and hiſtory, and afterwards upon compoſition and criticiſm. He has alſo taught the French language laſt winter, and it will continue to be taught to thoſe who deſire to learn it.

During the whole courſe of their ſtudies, the three younger claſſes, two every evening formerly, and now three, becauſe of their increaſed number, pronounce an oration on a ſtage erected for that purpoſe in the hall, immediately after prayers; that they may learn, by early habit, preſence of mind and proper pronunciation and geſture in public ſpeaking. This excellent practice, which has been kept up almoſt from the firſt foundation of the College, has had the moſt admirable effects. The ſenior ſcholars, every five or ſix weeks, pronounce orations of their own compoſition, to which all perſons of any note in the neighborhood are invited or admitted.

The College is now furniſhed with all the moſt important helps to inſtruction. The library contains a very large collection of valuable books. The leſſons of aſtronomy are given upon the orrery, lately invented and conſtructed by David Rittenhouſe, Eſq. which is reckoned by the beſt judges the moſt excellent in its kind of any ever yet produced; and when what is commiſſioned and now upon its way is added to what the College already

poſſeſſes, the apparatus for mathematics and natural philoſophy will be equal, if not ſuperior, to any on the continent.

As we have never yet been obliged to omit or alter it for want of ſcholars, there is a fixed annual Commencement on the laſt Wedneſday of September, when, after a variety of public exerciſes, always attended by a vaſt concourſe of the politeſt company from the different parts of this province and the cities of New-York and Philadelphia, the ſtudents whoſe ſenior year is expiring, are admitted to the degree of Bachelors of Arts; the Bachelors of three years ſtanding, to the degrees of Maſters; and ſuch other higher degrees granted as are either regularly claimed, or the Truſtees think fit to beſtow upon thoſe who have diſtinguiſhed themſelves by their literary productions, or their appearances in public life.

On the day preceding the Commencement laſt year, there was (and it will be continued every year hereafter) a public exhibition, and voluntary contention for prizes, open for every member of College. Theſe were firſt, ſecond, and third prizes, on each of the following ſubjects. 1. Reading the Engliſh language with propriety and grace, and being able to anſwer all queſtions on its orthography and grammar. 2. Reading the Latin and Greek languages in the ſame manner, with particular attention to true quantity. 3. Speaking Latin. 4. Latin verſions. 5. Pronouncing Engliſh orations. The preference was determined by ballot, and all preſent permitted to vote, who were graduates of this or any other College.

As to the government of the college, no correction by ſtripes is permitted. Such as cannot be governed by reaſon and the principles of honor and ſhame, are reckoned unfit for reſidence in a college. The collegiate cenſures are, 1. Private admonition by the preſident, profeſſor, or tutor. 2. Before the faculty. 3. Before the whole claſs to which the offender belongs. 4. And the laſt and higheſt, before all the members of college aſſembled in the hall. And, to preſerve the weight and dignity of theſe cenſures, it has been an eſtabliſhed practice that the laſt or higheſt cenſure, viz. public admonition, ſhall never be

repeated upon the same person. If it has been thought necessary to inflict it upon any one, and if this does not preserve him from falling into such gross irregularities a second time, it is understood that expulsion is immediately to follow.

Through the narrowness of the funds, the government and instruction has hitherto been carried on by a president and three tutors. At last commencement, the trustees chose a professor of mathematics; and intend, as their funds are raised, to have a greater number of professorships, and carry their plan to as great perfection as possible.

The above relates wholly to what is properly the college; but there is also at the same place, established under the particular direction and patronage of the president, a grammar school, where boys are instructed in the Latin and Greek languages with the utmost care, and on the plan of the most approved teachers in Great-Britain. It is now so large as to have two masters for the languages, and one for writing and arithmetic; and as some are sent with a design only to learn the Latin, Greek, and French languages, arithmetic, geography, and the practical branches of the mathematics, without going through a full college course, such scholars are permitted to attend the instruction of the classes in whatever coincides with their plan. It is also now resolved, at the request of several gentlemen, to have an English master after next vacation, for teaching the English language regularly and grammatically, and for perfecting by English exercises those whose previous instruction may have been defective or erroneous.

I have thus laid before the public a concise account of the constitution of the college of New-Jersey, and must now earnestly recommend it to the assistance and patronage of men of liberal and ingenuous minds. I am sensible that nothing is more difficult, than to write in behalf of what the writer himself has so great a part in conducting, so as neither to fail in doing justice to the subject, nor exceed in improper or arrogant professions. And yet to employ others to write for us, who may have some pre-

tence as indifferent perſons, to embelliſh our characters, is liable to ſtill greater ſuſpicion. The very beſt ſecurity one can give to the public for decency and truth, is to write openly in his own perſon, that he may be under a neceſſity to anſwer for it, if it is liable to challenge.

This is the method I have determined to follow; and that I may neither offend the delicacy of my friends, nor provoke the reſentment of my enemies, I will endeavor humbly to recommend this college to the attention and eſteem of men of penetration and candor, chiefly from ſuch circumſtances as have little or no relation to the perſonal characters of thoſe now employed, but are eſſential to its ſituation and conſtitution, and therefore muſt be ſuppoſed to have not only the moſt powerful, but the moſt laſting effect. The circumſtances to which I would intreat the attention of impartial perſons, are the following.

1. The college of New-Jerſey is altogether independent. It hath received no favor from government but the charter, by the particular friendſhip of a perſon now deceaſed. It owes nothing but to the benefactions of a public ſo diffuſive that it cannot produce particular dependance, or operate by partial influence. From this circumſtance it muſt be free from *two* great evils, and derive the like number of ſolid advantages. There is no fear of being obliged to chuſe teachers upon miniſterial recommendation, or in compliance with the over-bearing weight of family intereſt. On the contrary, the truſtees are naturally led, and in a manner forced to found their choice upon the characters of the perſons, and the hope of public approbation. At the ſame time thoſe concerned in the inſtruction and government of the college, are as far removed, as the ſtate of human nature will admit, from any temptation to a fawning, cringing ſpirit, and mean ſervility in the hope of court favor or promotion.

In conſequence of this, it may naturally be expected, and we find by experience that hitherto in fact the ſpirit of liberty has breathed high and ſtrong in all the members. I would not be underſtood to ſay that a ſeminary of learn-

ing ought to enter deeply into political contention; far leſs would I meanly court favor by profeſſing myſelf a violent partiſan in any preſent diſputes. But ſurely a conſtitution which naturally tends to produce a ſpirit of liberty and independence, even though this ſhould ſometimes need to be reined in by prudence and moderation, is infinitely preferable to the dead and vapid ſtate of one whoſe very exiſtence depends upon the nod of thoſe in power. Another great advantage ariſing from this is the obligation we are under to recommend ourſelves, by diligence and fidelity, to the public. Having no particular prop to lean to on one ſide, we are obliged to ſtand upright and firm by leaning equally on all. We are ſo far from having our fund ſo complete, as of itſelf to ſupport the neceſſary expence, that the greater part of our annual income ariſes from the payments of the ſcholars, which we acknowledge with gratitude have been for theſe ſeveral years continually increaſing.

II. This leads me to obſerve, that it ought to be no inconſiderable recommendation of this college to thoſe at a diſtance, that it has the eſteem and approbation of thoſe who are neareſt it and know it beſt. The number of under graduates, or proper members of college, is near four times that of any college on the continent to the ſouthward of New-England, and probably greater than that of all the reſt put together. This we are at liberty to affirm has in no degree ariſen from pompous deſcriptions, or repeated recommendations in the public papers. We do not mean to blame the laudable attempts of others to do themſelves juſtice. We have been often found fault with, and perhaps are to blame for neglect in this particular. It is only mentioned to give full force to the argument juſt now uſed, and the fact is certainly true. I do not remember that the name of the college of New-Jerſey has been above once or twice mentioned in the newſpapers for three years, except in a bare recital of the acts of the annual commencements. The preſent addreſs ariſes from neceſſity, not choice; for had not a more private application been found impracticable, the preſs had probably never been employed.

III. It may not be amiſs to obſerve on this ſubject, that the great utility of this ſeminary has been felt over an extenſive country. Many of the clergy, epiſcopal and preſbyterian, in the different colonies, received their education here, whoſe exemplary behavior and other merit we ſuffer to ſpeak for themſelves. We are alſo willing that the public ſhould attend to the characters and appearance of thoſe gentlemen in the law and medical departments, who were brought up at Naſſau-Hall, and are now in the cities of New-York and Philadelphia, and in different parts of the continent or iſlands. Two at leaſt of the profeſſors of the juſtly celebrated Medical School lately founded in Philadelphia, and perhaps the greateſt number of their pupils, received their inſtruction here. We are not afraid, but even wiſh that our claim ſhould be decided by the conduct of thoſe in general who have come out from us, which is one of the moſt concluſive arguments; for *a tree is known by its fruits.* It is at the ſame time an argument of the moſt fair and generous kind; for it is left to be determined by mankind at their leiſure; and if the appeal be not in our favor, it muſt be unſpeakably injurious.

IV. The place where the college is built, is moſt happily choſen for the health, the ſtudies and the morals of the ſcholars. All theſe were particularly attended to when the ſpot was pitched upon. Princeton is on a riſing ground, from whence there is an eaſy gradual deſcent for many miles on all quarters, except the north and northweſt, from whence at the diſtance of one mile it is ſheltered by a range of hills covered with woods. It has a moſt beautiful appearance, and in fact has been found one of the healthieſt places, as it is ſituated in the middle of one of the moſt healthful countries, on the whole continent. It is upon the great poſt road, almoſt equally diſtant from New-York and Philadelphia, ſo as to be a centre of intelligence, and have an eaſy conveyance of every thing neceſſary, and yet to be wholly free from the many temptations in every great city, both to the neglect of ſtudy, and the practice of vice. The truth is, it is to this happy circumſtance, ſo wiſely attended to by the firſt truſtees, that

we owe our being enabled to keep up the diſcipline of the college with ſo great regularity and ſo little difficulty. We do not wiſh to take any honor in this reſpect to ourſelves. Doubtleſs the maſters of every college will do their beſt in this reſpect. But it is not in the power of thoſe who are in great cities to keep the diſcipline with equal ſtrictneſs, where boys have ſo many temptations to do evil, and can ſo eaſily and effectually conceal it after it is done. With us, they live all in college, under the inſpection of their maſters; and the village is ſo ſmall that any irregularity is immediately and certainly diſcovered, and therefore eaſily corrected.

It has ſometimes happened, through rivalſhip or malice, that our diſcipline has been cenſured as too ſevere and rigorous. This reproach I always hear, not with patience only, but with pleaſure. In the mouth of an adverſary, it is a clear confeſſion that the government is ſtrict and regular. While we avail ourſelves of this, we prove that the accuſation of oppreſſive rigor is wholly without foundation, from the number of ſcholars, and the infrequency of public cenſures, but above all from the warm and almoſt enthuſiaſtic attachment of thoſe who have finiſhed their courſe. Could their eſteem and friendſhip be expected in return for an auſtere and rigorous confinement, out of which they had eſcaped as birds out of the ſnare of the fowler? We admit that it is inſupportable to the idle and profligate; for either they will not bear with us, or we will not bear with them; but from thoſe who have applied to their ſtudies, and reached the honors of college, we have, almoſt without exception, found the moſt ſincere, active and zealous friendſhip.

V. This college was founded, and hath been conducted upon the moſt catholic principles. The charter recites as one of its grounds, "That every religious denomination may have free and equal liberty and advantage of education in the ſaid college, any different ſentiments in religion notwithſtanding." Accordingly there are now, and have been from the beginning, ſcholars of various denominations from the moſt diſtant colonies, as well as Weſt-India iſlands; and they muſt ne-

ceſſarily confeſs, that they never met with the leaſt uneaſineſs or diſreſpect on this account. Our great advantage on this ſubject is the harmony of the board of truſtees, and the perfect union in ſentiment among all the teachers, both with the truſtees and with one another. On this account, there is neither inclination nor occaſion to meddle with any controverſy whatever. The author of this addreſs confeſſes that he was long accuſtomed to the order and dignity of an eſtabliſhed church, but a church which hath no contempt or deteſtation of thoſe who are differently organized. And, as he hath ever been in that church an oppoſer of lordly domination and ſacerdotal tyranny, ſo he is a paſſionate admirer of the equal and impartial ſupport of every religious denomination which prevails in the northern colonies, and is perfect in Pennſylvania and the Jerſeys, to the unſpeakable advantage of thoſe happy and well conſtituted governments.

With reſpect to the college of New-Jerſey, every queſtion about forms of church government is ſo entirely excluded, that though I have ſeen one ſet of ſcholars begin and finiſh their courſe, if they know nothing more of religious controverſy than what they learned here, they have that ſcience wholly to begin. This is altogether owing to the union of ſentiment mentioned above: for, if you place as teachers in a college, perſons of repugnant religious principles, they muſt have more wiſdom and ſelf-denial than uſually fall to the lot of humanity, if the whole ſociety is not divided into parties, and marſhalled under names, if the changes are not frequent, and, when they take place they will be as well known as any event that can happen in ſuch a ſociety. On the contrary, there is ſo little occaſion with us to canvaſs this matter at all, that, though no doubt accident muſt diſcover it as to the greateſt number, yet ſome have left the college, as to whom I am wholly uncertain at this hour to what denomination they belong. It has been and ſhall be our care to uſe every mean in our power to make them good men and good ſcholars; and, if this is the caſe, I ſhall hear of their future character and uſefulneſs with unfeigned ſatisfaction, under every name by which a real proteſtant can be diſtinguiſhed.

Having already experienced the generosity of the public in many parts of the continent of America, I cannot but hope that the gentlemen of the islands will not refuse their assistance, according to their abilities, in order to carry this seminary to a far greater degree of perfection than any to which it has yet arrived. The express purpose to which the benefactions now requested will be applied, is the establishment of new professorships, which will render the institution not only more complete in itself, but less burthensome to those who have undertaken the important trust. The whole branches of mathematics and natural philosophy are now taught by one professor; and the president is obliged to teach divinity and moral philosophy, as well as chronology, history, and rhetoric, besides the superintendance and government of the whole. The short lives of the former presidents have been by many attributed to their excessive labors, which, it is hoped, will be an argument with the humane and generous to lend their help in promoting so noble a design.

I am, gentlemen,
Your most obedient,
Humble servant,
JOHN WITHERSPOON.

Nassau-Hall, at Princeton,
New-Jersey, March 21, 1772.

Proper Forms of DONATIONS to the COLLEGE by WILL.

OF CHATTELS PERSONAL.

Item, I A. B. do hereby give and bequeath the sum of unto the *Trustees of the College of New-Jersey*, commonly called *Nassau-Hall*, the same to be paid within months next after my decease; and to be applied to the uses and purposes of the *said College.*

OF REAL ESTATES.

I A. B. do give and devise unto the *Trustees of the College of New-Jersey*, commonly called *Nassau-Hall, and to their successors forever*, all that certain messuage and tract of land, &c.

AN ESSAY ON MONEY,

As a medium of commerce; with remarks on the advantages and disadvantages of paper admitted into general circulation.

FROM every channel of public intelligence we learn, that there is a diſpoſition in many of the legiſlatures of this country, to emit bills of credit by authority of government, and to make them in ſome meaſure at leaſt, or in ſome caſes, a legal tender for debts already contracted. This is a matter of great delicacy and danger. It has occaſioned a controverſial diſcuſſion of the ſubject in pamphlets and periodical publications. A few plauſible things, and but a few that deſerve that character, have been publiſhed in defence of the meaſure. Many ſhrewd and ſenſible things have been offered againſt it: but even theſe laſt have not been ſo connected and ſatisfying, as they might and ought to have been. Some of the pieces have been verboſe and declamatory, with many repetitions; others have been full of antitheſes, quaint ſayings, and witticiſms, which have no great tendency to con-

vince or perſuade; and ſome have been mingled with the local and party politics of particular ſtates. Perhaps theſe different ways of writing may be very proper for ſeveral claſſes of readers, and have a good effect; but there are certainly others who would require a different treatment, becauſe their miſtakes are owing not to deceitful intentions, but to erroneous judgment. This has given me a ſtrong deſire to try what can be done upon the ſubject by diſpaſſionate reaſoning. By this I mean, endeavoring to carry the matter back to its firſt principles, to explain them in ſo ſimple a manner, as that the unlearned may underſtand them; and then to deduce the practical conſequences with the general theory full in view.

It is impoſible to reach my purpoſe, without ſaying many things which in a ſeparate and detached manner have been ſaid by others; but this muſt be forgiven me; becauſe I mean to lay the whole ſyſtem before the reader, and every part in its proper order and connexion. Let us then begin by conſidering what gave riſe to money, and what is its nature and uſe? If there were but one man upon the earth, he would be obliged to prepare a hut for his habitation, to dig roots for his ſuſtenance, to provide ſkins or fig leaves for his covering, &c. in ſhort, to do every thing for himſelf. If but one or two more were joined with him, it would ſoon be found that one of them would be more ſkilful in one ſort of work, and another in a different; ſo that common intereſt would direct them, each to apply his induſtry to what he could do beſt and ſooneſt; to communicate the ſurplus of what he needed himſelf of that ſort of work to the others, and receive of their ſurplus in return. This directly points out to us, that a barter of commodities, or communication of the fruits of induſtry, is the firſt principle, or rather indeed conſtitutes the eſſence of commerce. As ſociety increaſes, the partition of employments is greatly diverſified; but ſtill the fruits of well directed induſtry, or the things neceſſary and uſeful in life, are what only can be called wealth.

In eſtabliſhing a mutual exchange of theſe, the firſt thing neceſſary is a ſtandard of computation, or common meaſure, by which to eſtimate the ſeveral commodities that may be offered to ſale, or may be deſired by purchaſers. Without this it is eaſy to ſee that the barter of commodities is liable to very great difficulties, and very great errors. This ſtandard or common meaſure muſt be ſomething that is well known to both parties, and of general or common uſe. As the firſt eſſays in any thing are generally rude and imperfect; ſo I think it appears from the monuments of remote antiquity, that in the early ſtages of ſociety, cattle were the firſt things made uſe of as a ſtandard*. But it would ſoon appear that this was a moſt inaccurate meaſure; becauſe one ox might be as good as two, from ſize, fatneſs, or other circumſtances. Therefore in place of this ſucceeded meaſures both of dry and liquid, that is, corn, wine, and oil. The firſt of theſe was of all others the moſt proper ſtandard, becauſe univerſally neceſſary, and liable to little variation. Men, upon an average, would probably eat nearly the ſame quantity in the moſt diſtant ages and countries. It ſeems to me, that this circumſtance of a ſtandard of computation being neceſſary in commerce, and the firſt thing neceſſary, has been in a great meaſure overlooked by moſt writers on money, or rather it has been confounded with the ſtandard value of the ſign, although eſſentially different from it; and the equivocal uſe of the terms has occaſioned great confuſion. I muſt however obſerve, not only that this muſt neceſſarily be taken in, but that if we confine ourſelves to a ſtandard of computation only, ſome known commodity, as meaſured grain, is better, and more intelligible and unalterable than any money whatever, that either has been or will be made. The great alteration in the value of gold and ſilver is known to every per-

* Servius Tullius, one of the Roman kings, is ſaid to have ſtamped ſome pieces with the figure of cattle; an ox, or a ſheep. This was as much as to ſay, this piece is of the value of an ox or a ſheep. Hence it is ſaid the Roman word *pecunia*, comes from *pecus*, cattle. Others have thought it was from the uſe of leather for money, *quasi pecudum corio*. But the firſt etymology ſeems to be the beſt. See a ſubſequent note.

ſon who has but dipped into hiſtory; and indeed is known to many, even by memory, in this country, ſince its firſt ſettlement*.

But after a ſtandard of computation had been agreed upon, in commerce even of the moſt moderate extent, ſomething farther would be abſolutely neceſſary. The actual and immediate barter of commodities could in a few inſtances take place. A man might have the thing that I wanted to purchaſe, but he might not need or deſire what I was willing to give for it. Another might want what I had to ſpare, but not have what I wanted to purchaſe with it. Beſides, bulky or periſhable commodities could not be carried about at an uncertainty, or with ſafety. Therefore, it became very early neceſſary, that there ſhould be ſome ſign or ſigns agreed upon, which ſhould repreſent the abſent commodities, or rather ſhould repreſent the ſtandard of computation, in all its diviſions and multiplications. Theſe ſigns muſt be ſuch as could eaſily be carried about, and therefore could be readily applied to every kind of tranſactions, which were connected with the commutation of property.

Let us examine the nature and meaning of theſe ſigns more particularly. They are of the nature of a tally, that is to ſay, they are intended to mark and aſcertain a fact. Now the fact is, that the perſon who can ſhow thoſe ſigns, having purchaſed them by his goods or induſtry, is entitled to receive from ſomebody, a certain value, or to

* There are two eſtates near one of the colleges in Scotland, which were originally taxed an equal number of bolls of grain (a boll is about 6 buſhels) to that inſtitution. In very remote times, it pleaſed the proprietor of one of theſe eſtates, with conſent of the college, to convert the payment into money, according to the then current value, which was a groat or four pence ſterling for a boll. At this preſent time, the one of theſe farms pays the ſame number of bolls, that the other does of groats; which is about thirty-two for one. There is alſo ſaid to be exiſting, an old leaſe of a burrow acre near a town in Scotland, for which the tenant was to pay a boll of wheat, and a boll of barley, or if he did not bring the grain between Chriſtmaſs and Candlemaſs, the proprietor was not obliged to accept of it, but he muſt pay a ſum which is now 10-12ths of a penny ſterling for the boll of wheat, and 8-12ths for the boll of barley.

a certain amount, which they ſpecify, of the ſtandard of computation. They have always a reference to the ſtandard of computation, and at laſt, by that known reference, the diſtinction between them and the ſtandard of computation is loſt, and they become a ſecondary ſtandard of computation themſelves. Thus a piece is intended at firſt to be of the value of a meaſure of grain; but at laſt men come to make their bargain by the number of pieces inſtead of the number of meaſures; uſing the ſign for the thing ſignified. Thus alſo, ſometimes at leaſt, an ideal meaſure, generated by the other two, comes to be the ſtandard of computation; as in England, the pound ſterling is the money unit, though there be no coin preciſely correſponding to it. This is ſufficient to explain the relation of the ſign to the ſtandard of computation, and at laſt, if I may ſpeak ſo, its conſolidation with it.

I have ſaid above, that the perſon poſſeſſing the ſign is entitled to receive a certain value from *somebody*. The reaſon of this is, becauſe his debtor is not the ſame in every ſtate of things. If we conſider the ſign as given from one individual to another, it is of the nature of a promiſſory note, and is a confeſſion of having received ſo much property. Probably there were often ſuch ſigns or tokens given in the infancy of ſociety; and it would then ſignify, that if the ſeller were to come again, at a diſtance of time, and find the buyer in poſſeſſion of ſuch goods as he wanted, he would be entitled to receive the amount of the ſign or token that had been given him. But the convenience of uſing ſigns is ſo great, that it would immediately occaſion their being made uſe of by general conſent, expreſs or implied; and, at laſt, the matter would be taken under the direction of the ruling part of the community. In both caſes, but eſpecially in this laſt, the ſociety becomes bound to the perſon who receives the ſigns for his goods or induſtry, that they ſhall be to him of the value that they ſpecify. I will afterwards ſhow, that this was not the firſt but the laſt ſtep taken in the uſe of ſigns, and give the reaſons for it; but it is proper to mention it now, when we are conſidering the nature and uſe of ſigns in that ſingle view.

Let it be obſerved here that as it was before ſaid, if we aim at no more than a ſtandard of computation, ſome commodities are not only as good, but better than any money, ſo if we confine ourſelves to a ſign only ſeparate from a ſtandard, many things that might be named are not only as good, but far better than either the ſtandard itſelf, or what we call money, becauſe they are much more eaſily reckoned, tranſported and concealed. This appears particularly from the ſtate of ſigns in modern times, after ſo much experience and inprovement has taken place. For if we can guard ſufficiently againſt the dangers to which they are expoſed, ſigns inconceivably facilitate commerce. We can put any value we pleaſe in an obligation written on a few inches of paper, and can ſend it over the world itſelf at very little expenſe, and conceal it ſo eaſily that there ſhall be no danger of its being taken from us.

But it muſt have appeared, and did ſpeedily appear, that all mere ſigns labor under an eſſential defect. They depend ultimately on the faith or credit of the perſons uſing or anſwerable for them. Now, whether theſe be individuals or the multitude by general cuſtom and implied conſent, or even the ruling part of the ſociety, there is very great uncertainty. Therefore ſomething farther is neceſſary to make a complete ſymbol or medium of general commerce, and that is, *a pledge* or ſtandard of value that may be a ſecurity or equivalent for the thing given for it, and at all times be ſufficient to purchaſe a like value of any thing that may be needed by him that holds it. An abſent commodity well known, or even an idea well underſtood, may be a ſtandard of computation and common meaſure; any thing almoſt whatever may be a ſign, though, ſince the art of writing has been known, paper is the beſt, but both are eſſentially defective; there is wanting a value in the ſign, that ſhall give not only a promiſe or obligation, but actual poſſeſſion of property for property.

The mentioning of theſe three diſtinct ends to be ſerved by the medium of commerce, and illuſtrating them ſeparately, was not to convey the idea that there were three ſteps of this kind taken at a diſtance of time from each

other, or that men firſt continued long to deal in groſs barter; and after that invented ſigns, and were content with them for another period; and at laſt, perfected the plan, by getting ſigns poſſeſſed of real value. On the contrary, it was to ſhow that any thing uſed as a medium of univerſal or general commerce, muſt be able to ſerve all the three fore-mentioned purpoſes; and that if there is any production of nature, or fabrication of art, that can unite the whole, at leaſt as far as they are capable of being united, this muſt be the great deſideratum. Now it has been found in experience, that the precious metals, eſpecially thoſe now called by that name, gold and ſilver, do anſwer all the three ends in a great degree. It cannot be denied that they have been uſed for this purpoſe, in fact, from the earlieſt times, and through every nation in the old world, and indeed alſo in the new, with ſuch exception only as will confirm the principles of the theory. If any man thinks that this has happened by accident, or through the whim or caprice of mankind, as one would ſuſpect from the language ſometimes uſed in ſpeech and writing, he is greatly miſtaken. No effect of whim or accident ever was ſo uniform or ſo laſting. The truth is, that theſe metals do poſſeſs in a great degree ſuperior to every thing elſe, the qualities neceſſary for the purpoſes mentioned above.

This will appear to any impartial perſon who will conſider, with a view to the preceding principles, what qualities a medium of general commerce ought to poſſeſs. It ought then, to be (1) valuable; (2.) rare; (3.) portable; (4.) diviſible; (5.) durable. Whoever will examine the matter with attention, muſt perceive that any one of theſe qualities being wholly or greatly wanting, the ſyſtem would be either entirely ruined or remarkably injured. Let us examine them ſeparately.

1. It muſt be *valuable;* that is to ſay, it muſt have an intrinſic worth in itſelf, in ſubſtance diſtinct from the form. By value or intrinſic worth here, muſt be underſtood preciſely the ſame thing that gives to every other commodity its commercial value. Do you aſk what that is? I anſwer, its being either neceſſary or remarkably uſeful for the pur-

poſes of life in a ſocial ſtate, or at leaſt ſuppoſed to be ſo: and therefore the object of human deſire. Without this it could be no more than a bare ſign; nor indeed ſo uſeful in this view as many other ſigns. But we want ſomething that muſt not be only a ſtandard of computation, but a ſtandard of value; and therefore capable of being a pledge and ſecurity to the holder, for the property that he has exchanged for it. It is likely ſome will ſay, What is the intrinſic value of gold and ſilver? They are not wealth; they are but the ſign or repreſentative of commodities. Superficial philoſophers, and even ſome men of good underſtanding not attending to the nature of currency, have really ſaid ſo. What is gold, ſay ſome, the value is all in the fancy; you can neither eat nor wear it; it will neither feed, clothe nor warm you. Gold, ſay others, as to intrinſic value, is not ſo good as iron, which can be applied to many more uſeful purpoſes. Theſe perſons have not attended to the nature of commercial value, which is in a compound ratio of its uſe and ſcarceneſs. If iron were as rare as gold, it would probably be as valuable, perhaps more ſo. How many inſtances are there of things, which, though a certain proportion of them is not only valuable, but indiſpenſibly neceſſary to life itſelf, yet which from their abundance have no commercial value at all. Take for examples air and water. People do not bring theſe to market, becauſe they are in ſuperabundant plenty. But let any circumſtances take place that render them rare, and difficult to be obtained, and their value immediately riſes above all computation. What would one of thoſe who were ſtifled in the black hole at Calcutta, have given to get but near a window for a little air? And what will the crew of a ſhip at ſea, whoſe water is nearly expended, give for a freſh ſupply?

Gold and ſilver have intrinſic value as metals, becauſe from their ductility, durability, and other qualities, they are exceedingly fit for domeſtic utenſils, and many purpoſes in life. This circumſtance was the foundation of their uſe as a medium of commerce, and was inſeparable from it. No clearer proof of this can be adduced, than that in the earlieſt times, even when uſed in commerce,

they were weighed before they were divided into ſmaller pieces, and paſſed in tale. They muſt ſurely then have had intrinſic value; for their value was in proportion to their bulk or quantity. This circumſtance as a ſign made them worſe, but as a valuable metal made them better. The ſame thing appears as clearly from the practice of modern times. Even when they are taken into the management of the rulers of ſociety, and ſtamped under various denominations, there muſt be an exact regard had to their commercial value. The ſtamp upon them is the *sign*, the intrinſic worth of the metal is the *value*. It is now found, and admitted by every nation, that they muſt give to every piece that denomination and value in legal currency, that it bears in bullion; and if any do otherwiſe, there is neither authority nor force ſufficient to make it paſs*.

The author referred to in the note has given us quotations from three perſons of name in the literary world in ſupport of a contrary opinion. The firſt is Dr. Franklin, whom he makes to ſay, "Gold and ſilver are not intrinſically of equal value with iron; a metal of itſelf capable of many more beneficial uſes to mankind. Their value reſts chiefly on the eſtimation they *happen* to be in among the generality of nations, and the credit given to the opinion that eſtimation will continue; otherwiſe a pound of gold would not be a real equivalent for a buſhel of wheat." The ſecond is Anderſon on National Induſtry, who ſays "Money conſidered in itſelf, is of no value; but in many civilized nations, who have found how convenient it is

* An author on this ſubject in a pamphlet lately publiſhed, ſays, "The value of the precious metals is however enhanced by their peculiar aptitude to perform the office of an univerſal money beyond any real inherent value they poſſeſs. This extrinſic value of gold and ſilver, which belongs to them under the modification of coin or bullion, is totally diſtinct from their inherent value as a commodity." I do not very well comprehend what this gentleman means by the intrinſic value of gold and ſilver. Perhaps it is the ſtamp or nominal value affixed to them by the ſtate; but whatever it is, I will venture to aſſure him, that their value as coin is ſo far from being totally diſtinct from, that it muſt be preciſely the ſame with, their value as a commodity.

for facilitating the barter or exchange of one commodity for another, it has received an artificial value; so that although useless in itself, it has come to be accepted among all civilized nations, as a token proving that the person who is possessed of it, had given something of real value in exchange for it, and is on that account accepted of by another in exchange for something that is of real utility and intrinsic worth." The third is Sir James Stuart, who says, "By money, I understand any commodity which purely in itself is of no material use to man, but which acquires such an estimation from his opinion of it, as to become the universal measure of what is called value, and an adequate equivalent for any thing alienable." The name of any man how great soever, will not have much weight with me, when I perceive that in any instance he has mistaken his subject. This I believe has been the case with all the gentlemen just mentioned. There is a considerable confusion in the ideas expressed by the last two; but the thing in which they all agree, and for which they are adduced by this author, is, that they seem to deny the intrinsic value of gold and silver, and to impute the estimation in which they are held, to accidental opinion. Now I must beg leave to observe, as to the comparison of the intrinsic worth of gold and iron, if it were possible to determine whether, on supposition of iron and gold being in equal quantity, the one or the other would be the most valuable, it would not be worth a single straw in the present question; for if iron were the most valuable, it would in that case be the money, and the gold would be but in the next degree. Accidental opinion has nothing to do with it. It arises from the nature of things. As to a pound of gold not being, as to intrinsic value, equivalent to a bushel of wheat, it might with equal truth be affirmed, that to a man perishing with hunger, a mountain of gold would not be equivalent to half a pound of bread. But is this any argument against the intrinsic commercial value of gold, as it has taken place since the beginning of the world.

As to the other two authors, they seem to say, that money is in itself of no value, and of no material use to man.

If by *money* they mean gold and silver, the proposition is directly false; because they are both of material use for the purpose of social life. But what has led them into this error has been their abstracting the idea, and taking money in the single light of a sign, without considering it as a standard. Then no doubt, even gold, while it continues in this form, is of no other use than as a sign of property. But how little is this to the purpose? For it is equally true of every other commodity. A nail, while it continues a nail, is of no other use but joining boards together, or some similar purpose, and can neither be lock nor key; but a quantity of nails, or the iron which they contain, can be easily converted into either the one or the other. So a guinea, while it continues a guinea, is of no use whatever, but as an instrument of commerce; but the gold of which a guinea consists, can easily be converted into a ring, or any thing which its quantity will reach. This is what is called, with perfect propriety, its *intrinsic value.*

2. That which is the medium of commerce must be *rare.* It will not be necessary to say much upon this, because it has already received some illustration from what has gone before. It may however be observed, that the medium of commerce must not only be so rare, as to bring it within commercial value in ordinary cases, but it must be much more rare, than most other things, that its value may be increased, and a small quantity of it may represent goods of considerable variety and bulk. If gold and silver were only twenty times as plentiful as they are at present, they would still have a proper value, could be bought and sold, and applied to many useful purposes, but they would be quite unfit for general circulation.

3. The circulating medium must be *portable.* It must be capable of being carried to a distance with little trouble or expence, and of passing from hand to hand with ease and expedition. This is one of the reasons why it must be rare; but it deserves mention also by itself, because it is possible to conceive of things that may be both valuable and rare, and yet incapable of being carried about, and passing from one to another. Some precious drugs,

and ſome curioſities, may be ſo rare as to have a high value, and yet may be quite improper for circulation.

4. The medium of commerce muſt be *diviſible*. It ought to be capable of diviſion into very ſmall quantities. This is neceſſary in order to anſwer the diviſion of many commodities, and the conveniency of perſons of different ranks. It is of ſuch importance, that in the calculations of a complex and diverſified commerce, we find diviſions and fractional parts even of the ſmalleſt coins or denominations of money, that have ever yet been brought into uſe.

5. Laſtly. The medium of commerce ought to be *durable*. It ought to have this quality on two accounts; firſt, that in perpetually paſſing from hand to hand, it may not be broken or waſted; and, ſecondly, that if it is preſerved or laid up, as may be ſometimes neceſſary, and often agreeable or profitable, it may not be liable to be ſpeedily corrupted or conſumed.

All theſe particulars are not of equal moment and they have an intimate relation one to another; yet each of them is ſingly and ſeparately of importance, perhaps more than will be at firſt view apprehended. I think it is alſo plain that there is nothing yet known to mankind, in which they are all ſo fully united, as they are in gold and ſilver; which is the true reaſon why theſe metals have been applied as the inſtrument of commerce, ſince the beginning of the world, or as far back as hiſtory enables us to penetrate*.

* It has been ſuggeſted to me by a friend, that gold and ſilver poſſeſs another quality different from all the above, which, in an eminent degree, fits them for circulation as a medium, *viz.* that they are *equable*. The meaning of this expreſſion is, that the metal of each of theſe ſpecies, when pure, is of the ſame fineneſs and worth, and perfectly ſimilar, from whatever different mines, or from whatever diſtant parts it may have been procured; which, it is ſaid, is not the caſe with any other metal. It is affirmed, that the copper or lead that comes from one mine will be preferable to that which comes from another, even after this laſt has been refined to as high a degree as is poſſible; but that all gold and ſilver completely refined are perfectly alike, whether they come from Aſia, Africa, or Ame-

It will probably throw ſome light upon the above theory, if we take a brief view of the matter, as it has taken place in fact from the beginning of the world. This may be done now to the greater advantage, that the effects of particular cauſes, and the events that will take place in ſociety in particular circumſtances, have been ſo fully aſcertained by the experience of ages, and the progreſs of ſcience, that we are able to make a better uſe of the few remains of ancient hiſtory, than could have been done by thoſe who lived nearer to the events which are recorded. It appears then, that the diſcovery and uſe of metals was one of the earlieſt attainments of mankind. This might naturally be expected if they were within reach at all, becauſe of their very great utility in all works of induſtry, and indeed for all the purpoſes of convenience and luxury. Therefore, I ſuppoſe this fact will not be doubted: but it is a truth neither ſo obvious nor ſo much known, that gold, ſilver, and braſs, or rather copper, were the moſt ancient metals, and all of them antecedent to iron*. Theſe metals being applied to all the purpoſes of life, came of courſe to conſtitute a great part of the wealth of the people of ancient times. I have mentioned braſs, becauſe it was one of the metals earlieſt known, and upon the very principles above laid down, was in the beginning made uſe of for money by many ancient nations. Its being now in a great meaſure left out is an illuſtration and proof of what has been already

rica. I do not pretend to a certain knowledge of this; but if it be true, it is well worthy of being mentioned in this diſquiſition.

* See upon this ſubject Preſident Goguet's Riſe and Progreſs of Laws, Arts and Sciences. He has not only ſufficiently proved the fact, but alſo aſſigned the moſt probable reaſon for it, that theſe metals were found in many places of the earth almoſt pure, ſo as to need very little art in refining; whereas extracting iron from the ore is neither ſo eaſy nor ſo obvious. We learn from Homer, that in the wars of Troy, the weapons of war, offenſive and defenſive, were of copper; and ſome hiſtorians tell us that they had a method of tempering or hardening it ſo as to make it tolerably fit for the purpoſe, though certainly not equal to iron or ſteel.

ſaid. It is left out for no other reaſon than its having loſt one of the neceſſary qualities, viz. rarity. That it was made uſe of for money amongſt the Hebrews appears from many circumſtances. We read of gold, ſilver and braſs, brought as contributions to the tabernacle ſervice in the time of Moſes, and to the building of the temple in David's. That braſs was made uſe of as money in the early times of the Greeks and Romans, appears both from the aſſertions of hiſtorians, and from the very languages of both nations, for there it is made uſe of to ſignify money in general.* That it ceaſed to ſerve that purpoſe afterwards cannot be accounted for in any other way than as above, eſpecially as the neglect of it has been juſt as univerſal as the uſe of it was formerly.

We are alſo fully ſupported by hiſtory in affirming, that all theſe metals were at firſt eſtimated and paſſed in commerce by weight. We ſee that Abraham gave to Ephron for the cave of Machpelah, four hundred ſhekels of ſilver.† The Greek money was of different weights from the lower ſorts to the talent, which was the largeſt. The old Roman word *Pondo* was, as it were, the ſtandard, and the diviſions of it conſtituted their different denominations. From this we ſeem to have derived the Engliſh word pound. Very ſoon however they came to have either coins, or at leaſt ſmall pieces reckoned by number. Abimelech gave to Abraham, as Sarah's brother, one

* In the Roman language, *æs* ſignifies not only braſs, but money in general, and from it many other words are derived; as, *ararium*, the treaſury; *æs alienum*, debt; *ære mutare*, to buy or ſell for money, &c. So in the Greek tongue, *chalkos* ſignifies braſs, *achalkos* and *achalkein*, to be without money, or poor. When the other metals came to be in uſe as money, the words received the ſame meaning in the language as, *Argenti ſitis—auri ſacra fames*, the deſire of money. Things proceeded in a way perfectly ſimilar in the three ancient nations of whom we have the diſtincteſt accounts, the Hebrews, Greeks and Romans. *Nahus keseph zahaw*, in Hebrew; *chalkos arguros* and *chrusos* in Greek; and *æs argentum* and *aurum*, in Latin, are all uſed for money in general.

† See Geneſis xxiii. 16. And Abraham weighed to Ephron, the money that he had ſaid, in the preſence of the ſons of Heth, 400 ſhekels of ſilver, current money with the merchant.

thouſand keſeph; and Joſeph was ſold for twenty keſeph, and he gave to his brother Benjamin three hundred keſeph. As the word keſeph ſignifies ſilver, they muſt have been reckoned by tale, and are probably very juſtly tranſlated pieces. Agreeably to all this, the time when the Romans began to coin braſs, and ſome hundred years afterwards ſilver and gold, is diſtinctly mentioned by the hiſtorians*.

It may be proper to obſerve here, that ſeveral antiquaries have mentioned that ſome barbarous nations made uſe of baſer metals, ſuch as lead, tin, iron, and even leather, ſhells and bark of trees for money. This is no way contrary to the above theory, for ſome nations might indeed uſe lead, iron and tin, as things of value, upon the ſame principles as others uſed gold, ſilver and braſs. I think it is ſaid, and indeed it is more than probable, that the nails given by our voyagers to the inhabitants of the South-ſea iſlands, paſſed from hand to hand as inſtruments of commerce. As to leather, ſhells, &c. I ſuſpect ſome part of this is fabulous; but if it did take place in any meaſure, it has been a rude eſſay, uſing the ſign ſeparately from the ſtandard, and could not be of any great extent or long duration. We know indeed of one nation, after ſociety had been far advanced, that made uſe of iron, even when very plentiful, for money, viz. the Lacedemonians. But this was not at all from rudeneſs or ignorance; it was one of Lycurgus's extraordinary inſtitutions, who intended by it (and did not conceal his intention) to baniſh riches, or real and proper money from the ſtate. He indeed baniſhed induſtry at the ſame time, for none of his citizens were allowed even to be huſbandmen, or to cultivate their lands. This was left to the ſlaves. I do not find, therefore, that there is any thing in hiſtory

* We have the expreſs teſtimony of Pliny upon this ſubject, lib. 33. cap. 3. "Servius rex primus ſignavit æs. Antea rudi uſos Romæ Timaus tradit. Signatum eſt nota pecudum unde et pecunia appellanta. Servius firſt coined braſs. Timaus ſays they uſed it formerly rough or uncoined at Rome. It was marked with the figure of cattle, whence alſo it was called *pecunia*." The ſame author tells us, that ſilver began to be coined at Rome in the 485th year of the city, and gold 72 years after.

deſerving credit, that militates againſt the theory above laid down.

Having thus laid down the theory of money, and ſupported it by hiſtory and experience, I proceed to draw a few inferences from it, and apply them to ſome opinions which have taken place, and ſome meaſures which have been adopted or propoſed with reſpect to currency and commerce in this country. In the firſt place, the above theory will enable every intelligent perſon to fix in his mind preciſely what is or ought to be the meaning of a *circulating medium*. This phraſe is in every body's mouth, and we meet with it continually in the eſſays publiſhed in the newſpapers, and the ſpeeches of ſenators in public aſſemblies. We may ſay of this as controverſial divines uſed to ſay long ago, that a miſconception of this is the *proton pseudos*, the radical error. Not long ſince a writer in one of the papers ſaid it was agreed on all hands that there is at preſent a ſcarcity of a circulating medium. To this I anſwer, that it is not agreed upon on any hand, but among thoſe who are wholly ignorant of the meaning of the expreſſion. The circulating medium is not yours nor mine; it is not the riches of Holland, nor the poverty of Sweden. It is that indefinite quantity of the precious metals that is made uſe of among the nations connected in commerce. Whether any particular perſon, city, or nation, is rich or poor, has more or leſs comparatively of it, is nothing to the purpoſe. Every one will receive of the circulating medium that quantity which he is entitled to by his property or induſtry. It has been ſhown that rarity is one of the qualities of a circulating medium. If it were more rare than it is, a leſs quantity would be ſufficient to repreſent a ſtated meaſure of property. If it were more plentiful than it is, a greater quantity would be neceſſary; but the comparative riches or poverty of nations or perſons would be altogether the ſame.

Is any body ignorant that half a century ago in this country, a man might have bought a buſhel of wheat for one quarter of a dollar, for which now he muſt pay a whole dollar. Was not the quarter dollar then as good a circulating medium as the whole dollar is now? And was

not the man juſt as rich who had it in his pocket? Undoubtedly. Nay, I muſt further ſay, it was a better circulating medium, becauſe it was of leſs ſize and weight. Has not the quantity of the precious metals increaſed greatly ſince the diſcovery of the mines of South America? Is not the quantity now neceſſary for any conſiderable purchaſe ſo great as to be burdenſome in the tranſportation? The price of a good horſe in ſilver would at preſent be a great incumbrance on a long journey. How eaſy were it to point out places and countries in which there is a greater quantity of the circulating medium than any where elſe, and yet at the ſame time greater national and perſonal poverty, and probably for this very reaſon. What would it ſignify to a laborer in the mines of Peru, if he ſhould get half a johannes, or even two, for a day's work, if at the ſame time he could hardly purchaſe with both as much proviſion as to keep body and ſoul together? Are not theſe things true? Are they not known to be ſo? What then muſt we ſay of the extreme ignorance and inattention, to ſay no worſe, of thoſe perſons who are continually telling us that there is a want of circulating medium? Are not gold and ſilver a circulating medium, whoſe currency is univerſal? Are theſe then too ſcarce for that purpoſe, when there is hardly a negro ſlave, male or female, without ſilver buckles in their ſhoes, and many of them with rings and other ornaments of gold, which five hundred years ago would have denoted a prince or princeſs? Perhaps I have inſiſted longer on this than was neceſſary, but I have been induced to it by the frequent complaints upon this ſubject, and the abſurd application of the phraſe, a circulating medium. More reflections will occur, connected with this ſubject, in the ſubſequent parts of my diſcourſe. In the mean time I will cloſe by ſaying to my reader, you and I may be poor men, the ſtate in which we live may be a poor ſtate, we may want property, rents, reſources and credit, but a circulating medium we want not.

2. From the principles above laid down it will appear, that money having as one of its eſſential qualities, an intrinſic, that is to ſay, a commercial value, it muſt be not

only a ſign and ſtandard or a medium of commerce, but alſo itſelf a commodity, or a ſubject of commerce. There are many tranſactions reſpecting money in a trading nation, in which it is conſidered ſingly in this view. Theſe it is unneceſſary for me to enumerate, but even where it is applied directly or principally as a medium of alienation, its value as a ſtandard doth and muſt always follow and accommodate itſelf to its value as a commodity. Hence it follows neceſſarily that money muſt be ſubject to every rule that other commodities are ſubject to in buying and ſelling. One of the chief of theſe is, that it muſt riſe and fall in price according to the quantity that is brought to market, compared with the demand there is for it. This is an unavoidable conſequence, and as neceſſary in the caſe of money as in that of any commodity whatever. If a greater quantity of money than before is brought into any country, even though brought by the faireſt and moſt honorable means, viz. increaſing induſtry and profitable trade, it will have the effect of raiſing the price of other commodities in general, and of induſtry, which is the ſource of all commodities. But we muſt obſerve, that men are apt to view this in a wrong light. One commodity may riſe or fall by its own plenty or ſcarceneſs; but when there is a great and general riſe of prices, of all commodities, it would be at leaſt as proper, or rather much more ſo, to ſay that money had fallen, than that goods had riſen.

We had ſo large experience of this during the war, by the exceſſive emiſſions of paper money, that it needs hardly any illuſtration. It is true, ſome perſons did then and do now ſuppoſe, that the depreciation of the money was owing as much to the diſaffection of ſome inhabitants, and the counterfeiting, and other artful endeavors of our enemies to deſtroy it, as to the increaſed quantity. But in this they were quite miſtaken. Jealouſy or ſuſpicion of the money would have had very different effects from a gradual and continual riſe of prices. If I meet with a ſuſpicious piece of money, I do not raiſe the price of my goods, but refuſe to ſell them. This was indeed the caſe with all thoſe who doubted the money of Con-

greſs in time of the war. Beſides it is plain, that the American cauſe was moſt doubtful, and its enemies moſt numerous in the years 1776 and 1777, and yet the currency of the money was then very general, and its depreciation ſlow; whereas in the three following years, when in conſequence of the French treaty and other European alliances, the confidence of the public in the cauſe was increaſed, the depreciation was accelerated in an amazing degree. I muſt alſo here make a remark upon another opinion often expreſſed during the war, that the depreciation muſt have been owing to other cauſes than the quantity, becauſe it was greater than what they called the natural depreciation, in conſequence of the quantity. By this they meant, that it was not regular; but when the quantity had ariſen, ſuppoſe to five for one, the depreciation was as fifteen or twenty for one. Theſe perſons did not underſtand the depreciation of a commodity in conſequence of its quantity, for it is not regular and equable, as in arithmetical progreſſion, but rapid and increaſing, ſo as ſoon to get beyond all computation. If there is in any country but one tenth part more of any commodity than there is any demand for, the price will probably fall more than one half; and if there is double or treble the quantity needed, it will be what merchants call a drug, that cannot be ſold at all, but if it be a periſhable commodity, muſt ſink in the hand of the poſſeſſor.

I have ſaid above that the increaſe of money, even though in conſequence of national proſperity, that is to ſay, internal induſtry and profitable trade, will yet neceſſarily have the effect of raiſing the price of induſtry, and its fruits. This, however, muſt evidently be in a far higher degree, and attended with much more pernicious effects, when it is thrown into circulation without induſtry; as when ſilver is found in capacious mines, or paper is iſſued by the authority of a ſtate, without meaſure and without end. I verily believe that if as many millions of ſilver dollars had fallen from heaven and been thrown into circulation as there were paper ones iſſued by the United States, the diſorder would have been as great or greater than it was. At leaſt it would have been ſo at firſt, the

difference would have been, that silver being current over all, it would have soon gone abroad and found its level, so that the alteration would have been ultimately not in the United States, but in the general circulating medium over the whole earth. Those however among whom it was first found, and who received it without industry, would have suffered most by it. Among them it would have produced laziness and luxury. Other nations would have drained it from them only by superior industry. The state of the Spanish monarchy at present ought to be, and indeed in a great measure has been, a lesson to the whole world. At the time when they got possession of South-America they were the most powerful and wealthy state in Europe. Would any man at that time have been reckoned sound in his judgment who should have affirmed that they would have grown poor, by the means of the gold and silver mines? Yet it has happened so, and now there is hardly any politician so shallow but he can assign the reason of it. They thought that gold and silver would at once procure them every thing without working; but forgot that the more they had of it, they must pay so much the more to those who were willing to work for them.

3. The above principles will clearly show, that what is commonly called paper money, that is, bills bearing that the person holding them is entitled to receive a certain sum specified in them, is not, properly speaking, money at all. It is barely a sign without being a pledge or standard of value, and therefore is essentially defective as a medium of universal commerce. I will afterwards speak of the different kinds of it, and point out their real and proper uses; but in the mean time I observe, that to arm such bills with the authority of the state, and make them a legal tender in all payments, is an absurdity so great, that is not easy to speak with propriety upon it. Perhaps it would give offence if I should say, it is an absurdity reserved for American legislatures; no such thing having ever been attempted in the old countries. It has been found, by the experience of ages, that money must have a standard of value, and if any prince or state debase the metal below the standard, it is utterly impossible to mako

it ſucceed. How then can it be poſſible to make that ſucceed, which has no value at all? In all ſuch inſtances, there may be great injuries done to particular perſons by wiping off debts; but to give ſuch money general currency is wholly impoſſible. The meaſure carries abſurdity in its very face. Why will you make a law to oblige men to take money when it is offered them? Are there any who refuſe it when it is good? If it is neceſſary to force them, does not this demonſtrate that it is not good? We have ſeen indeed this ſyſtem produce a moſt ludicrous inverſion of the nature of things. For two or three years we conſtantly ſaw and were informed of creditors running away from their debtors, and the debtors purſuing them in triumph, and paying them without mercy.

Let us examine this matter a little more fully. Money is the medium of commercial tranſactions. Money is itſelf a commodity. Therefore every tranſaction in which money is concerned, by being given or promiſed, is ſtrictly and properly ſpeaking, a bargain, or as it is well called in common language, an agreement. To give, therefore, authority or nominal value by law to any money, is interpoſing by law, in commerce, and is preciſely the ſame thing with laws regulating the prices of commodities, of which, in their full extent, we had ſufficient experience during the war. Now nothing can be more radically unjuſt, or more eminently abſurd, than laws of that nature. Among all civilians, the tranſactions of commerce are ranged under the head of contracts. Without entering into the nicer diſtinctions of writers upon this ſubject, it is ſufficient for me to ſay, that commerce, or buying and ſelling, is found upon that ſpecies of contracts that is moſt formal and complete. They are called in the technical language, *Onerous contracts*, where the proper and juſt value is ſuppoſed to be given or promiſed, on both ſides. That is to ſay, the perſon who offers any thing to ſale, does it becauſe he has it to ſpare, and he thinks it would be better for him to have the money, or ſome other commodity, than what he parts with; and he who buys, in like manner, thinks it would be better for him to receive

the commodity, than to retain the money. There may be miſtakes or fraud in many tranſactions; but theſe do not affect the argument in the leaſt. A fair and juſt value is always ſuppoſed or profeſſed to be given on both ſides.

Well! is it agreed that all commerce is founded on a complete contract? Let then any perſon who will, open as many books as he pleaſes written upon the ſubject, and tell me whether he does not always find there that one of the eſſential conditions of a lawful contract, and indeed the firſt of them, is, that it be *free* and *mutual*. Without this it may be ſomething elſe, and have ſome other binding force, but it is not a contract. To make laws therefore, regulating the prices of commodities, or giving nominal value to that which had no value before the law was made, is altering the nature of the tranſaction altogether. Perhaps a compariſon of this with other tranſactions of a different kind might ſet this matter in a clear light. Suppoſe a man were to ſay, to one of our lawgivers upon this ſubject as follows: When you make a law laying on a tax, and telling me I muſt pay ſo much to the public and common expences of the ſtate, I underſtand this very well. It falls under the head of *authority*. You may lay on an improper or injudicious tax that will operate unequally, or not be productive of what you expect; but ſtill this is within your line, and if I have any complaint, I can only wiſh that at the next election we may get wiſer men. Again, a Juſtice of Peace in time of war may give a preſs-warrant, and take my horſes and waggons to tranſport proviſions or baggage for an army. I underſtand this alſo; writers and reaſoners tell me that it falls under the head of what they call the *rights of neceſſity*. The meaning of this is, that no civil conſtitution can be ſo perfect but that ſome caſes will occur, in which the property of individuals muſt give way to the urgent call of common utility or general danger. Thus we know, that in cities, in caſe of a fire, ſometimes a houſe, without the conſent of its owner, will be deſtroyed to prevent the whole from being conſumed. But if you make a law that I ſhall be obliged to *ſell* my grain, my

cattle, or any commodity, at a certain price, you not only do what is unjuſt and impolitic, but with all reſpect be it ſaid, you ſpeak nonſenſe; for I do not *sell* them at all: you take them from me. You are both buyer and ſeller, and I am the ſufferer only.

I cannot help obſerving that laws of this kind have an inherent weakneſs in them; they are not only unjuſt and unwiſe, but for the moſt part impracticable. They are an attempt to apply authority to that which is not its proper object, and to extend it beyond its natural bounds; in both which we ſhall be ſure to fail. The production of commodities muſt be the effect of induſtry, inclination, hope, and intereſt. The firſt of theſe is very imperfectly reached by authority, and the other three cannot be reached by it at all. Perhaps I ought rather to have ſaid, that they cannot be directed by it, but they may be greatly counteracted; as people have naturally a ſtrong diſpoſition to reſiſt force, and to eſcape from conſtraint. Accordingly we found in this country, and every other ſociety who ever tried ſuch meaſures found, that they produced an effect directly contrary to what was expected from them. Inſtead of producing moderation and plenty, they uniformly produced dearneſs and ſcarcity. It is worth while to obſerve, that ſome of our legiſlatures ſaw ſo far into theſe matters as to perceive that they could not regulate the price of commodities, without regulating the price of the induſtry that produced them. Therefore they regulated the price of day-laborers. This however, though but one ſpecies of induſtry, was found to be wholly out of their power.

There were ſome inſtances mentioned at the time when theſe meaſures were in vogue, which ſuperficial reaſoners ſuppoſed to be examples of regulating laws attended with good effects. Theſe were the regulation of the prices of chairs, hackney-coaches, and ticket porters in cities, public ferries, and ſome others. But this was quite miſtaking the nature of the thing. Theſe inſtances have not the leaſt connexion with laws regulating prices in voluntary commerce. In all theſe caſes the perſons who are employed ſolicit the privilege, obtain a licence, and come under

voluntary engagements to ask no higher prices; so that there is as complete a free contract as in buying and selling in open shops. I am so fully convinced of the truth and justice of the above principles, that I think, were it proper at this time, I could show, that even in the most enlightened nations of Europe there are still some laws subsisting which work in direct opposition to the intention of their makers. Of this kind in general are the laws against forestalling and regrating. They are now indeed most of them asleep, and what the lawyers call in desuetude; but so far as they are executed, they have the most powerful tendency to prevent, instead of promoting, full and reasonable markets. As an example of our own skill in that branch, a law was past in Pennsylvania in time of the war precisely upon that principle. It ordained that in all imported articles there should be but one step between the importer and consumer, and therefore that none but those who bought from the ship should be allowed to sell again. I cite this instance by memory, but am certain that such was the spirit of the law. The makers of it considered that every hand through which a commodity passed must have a profit upon it, which would therefore greatly augment the cost to the consumer at last. But could any thing in the world be more absurd? How could a family at one hundred miles distance from the seaport be supplied with what they wanted? In opposition to this principle it may be safely affirmed, that the more merchants the cheaper goods, and that no carriage is so cheap, nor any distribution so equal or so plentiful as that which is made by those who have an interest in it, and expect a profit from it.

I have gone into this detail in order to show that tender laws, arming paper, or any thing not valuable in itself with authority are directly contrary to the very first principles of commerce. This was certainly the more necessary, because many of the advocates for such laws, and many of those who are instrumental in enacting them, do it from pure ignorance, without any bad intention. It may probably have some effect in opening their eyes to observe, that no paper whatever is a tender in any nation

in Europe. Even the notes of the bank of England, which are as good as gold, and thoſe of the bank of Holland, which are conſiderably better*, are not armed with any ſuch ſanction, and are not a legal tender in the proper ſenſe of that word. That is to ſay, though I ſuppoſe both of them, or any other paper circulating in full credit may be a tender in equity, ſo far as that the perſon offering them without ſuſpicion of their being refuſed, could not be condemned in any penalty or forfeiture; yet if the perſon who was to receive the money ſhould ſay, I am going abroad, I want gold or ſilver; it would lie upon the debtor and not the creditor to go and get them exchanged. We may perhaps even ſay more, viz. that the coinage of gold and ſilver in any country is not ſo much, if at all to oblige perſons to receive it at a certain value, as to aſcertain them that it is of the value ſtampt upon it. Without this ignorant perſons would be continually at a loſs to know the fineneſs and the weight of a piece offered to them. This will appear from the two following remarks. (1) If by any accident in the coinage, or fraud in the officers of the mint, ſome of the pieces had not the full quantity, or were not of ſufficient fineneſs, though the ſtamp were ever ſo genuine, if I could diſcover the defect, I ſhould be juſtified in refuſing it. (2) There is ſometimes a fluctuation in the comparative value of gold and ſilver, and in theſe caſes, though no doubt a debtor, till the error that has crept in be rectified by authority, has a right to pay in any lawful money; yet if I were ſelling goods, and gold had fallen in its value, I might ſafely ſay to the cuſtomer, in what coin are you to pay

* Perhaps it may be proper to inform ſome readers what this expreſſion refers to. It refers to the agio of the bank of Holland. A bill of that bank generally goes for a little more in payment with any dealer than the ſum it ſpecifies, and this advance or difference is callen the Agio of the Bank, and riſes or falls like the rate of exchange. This probably ariſes from its perfect ſecurity, and the very great advantage in point of eaſe and expedition, in transferring, reckoning, and concealing of paper above gold and ſilver. It gives occaſion to the vulgar ſaying in that country, That money goes into the bank but never comes out.

me? I will give you a yard of this silk for twenty-one sterling silver shillings, but if you give me a guinea I must have another shilling before I will part with it. The whole of this serves to show that nothing short of real money, which is of standard value, ought to be enforced by law in a well regulated society.

4. The principles above laid down will enable us to perceive clearly what is the nature of paper circulating as a medium of commerce, what is its real and proper use, and what are its dangers and defects. As to its nature, it is a sign but not a standard. It is properly an obligation, or to use a modern commercial phrase, it is a promissory note. It is not money, as has been shown above, but it is a promise of some person or body of men to pay money either on demand or at a particular time, or some general undefined future time. Obligations of this nature are of more sorts than one. Sometimes they are given by particular persons, or trading companies, who are considered as persons; and frequently in America they have been given by the legislature of the state. In the general definition I have included all kinds of negotiable paper, but it will not be necessary to insist upon more than two of them, viz. the notes of banking companies, and state emissions. Bills of exchange are not supposed to pass through many hands, but to proceed as speedily as may be to the place of their payment. Government securities are only bought and sold like other property, and so any bonds or other private obligations, may be transferred as often as people are willing to receive them; but the notes of banking companies, and the state emissions of this country are intended to be, properly speaking, a circulating medium. They are of various regular denominations, and intended to answer all the purposes of money in the smaller transactions of society as well as the larger, and even go to market for purchasing the necessaries of life.

As to value, such obligations must plainly depend upon the credit of the subscriber or obligor, and the opinion or expectation of the receiver. These are mutually necessary to their use in commerce. Let the resources or wealth of the subscriber be what they may, it is the public opi-

nion that muſt ultimately give them currency. This opinion, however, may be in ſome inſtances better, and in ſome worſe founded. That paper which may with moſt certainty and expedition be converted into gold and ſilver, ſeems evidently to have the advantage on this account. Therefore the notes of banking companies, while they maintain their credit, and continue to pay on demand, appear to be the beſt calculated for general uſe. They ſeem alſo to have another advantage, that private perſons and companies are upon a footing with the holder of the bills. He can arreſt them, and bring them to account and have juſtice done upon them; whereas he cannot call the legiſlature to account, but muſt wholly depend upon their fidelity as well as reſources. Yet it muſt be owned there have not been wanting inſtances formerly in this country, in which paper emiſſions by the ſtates have obtained full confidence, and met with no impediment in circulation.

Let us now conſider what is the proper uſe of paper currency, or whether it be of any real uſe at all. Many perſons in Europe have declared againſt it altogether as pernicious. I will endeavor to ſtate this matter with all the clearneſs I am capable of, and to give the reaſons for what I ſhall advance. We have ſeen above that nothing can be more abſurd than to ſay that we now want a circulating medium, and that paper is neceſſary for that purpoſe. A circulating medium we have already, not in too ſmall, but in too great quantity; ſo that any perſon who underſtands the ſubject may perceive that gold and ſilver, eſpecially the laſt, is loſing at leaſt one of the qualities neceſſary for that purpoſe, and becoming too bulky and heavy for eaſy and convenient tranſportation. Braſs, as has been ſhown above, was once as juſt and proper a medium of commerce as gold and ſilver are now. It has all the qualities neceſſary for that purpoſe ſtill, except rarity; ſo that if it were not too plentiful and too cheap, it would be money to this day. It is probable that this circumſtance of the abundance and weight of the precious metals is what gives to many ſuch an inclination for paper money. This will appear ſtrange to ſome, yet I believe

it is at bottom juſt. The cry with many is, we muſt have paper for a circulating medium, as there is ſuch a ſcarcity of gold and ſilver. Is this juſt? No. They miſtake their own poverty, or the nation's poverty, for a ſcarcity of gold and ſilver; whereas in fact, gold and ſilver uſed as a circulating medium are ſo cheap, and the quantity of a moderate ſum is ſuch an incumbrance that we want paper, which can be much more eaſily carried, and much more effectually concealed. So that, contrary to the vulgar idea, we are obliged to have recourſe to paper in ſeveral caſes, not for want of gold and ſilver, but their too great abundance.

This will appear to be a very uncouth idea to many perſons. What, they will ſay, too great abundance of gold and ſilver! when I go about from day to day, and cannot collect what is due to me; when my creditors are calling upon me and I cannot ſatisfy them. There is a ſcarcity of money every where. What ſhall be ſaid to ſatisfy theſe perſons? I muſt tell them plainly, It is their poverty, or the nation's poverty, and not a want of gold and ſilver, and if there were an hundred times as much gold and ſilver in circulation as there is, their poverty and difficulties would be juſt the ſame. If theſe perſons read the ſcriptures they may there learn, that in Solomon's time the ſilver was as plentiful *as ſtones in Jeruſalem*; probably they will think that all the people in Jeruſalem at that time muſt have lived like princes, but they muſt be told, that it was added as a neceſſary conſequence, that *it was nothing accounted of in the days of Solomon.*

If paper is not then needed as a circulating medium, what benefits ariſes from it? I anſwer, the uſes of paper ſubſtituted for money may be ſummed up under the two following heads: (1.) It is uſeful for facilitating commerce. (2.) It is uſeful for anticipating property or extending credit. Firſt, it is uſeful for facilitating commerce. Nothing can be more advantageous for that purpoſe than bills of exchange, which, without the actual tranſportation of money or goods, can transfer property even to the moſt diſtant places with the moſt perfect facility. There have been many perſons who have doubted

whether any other ſort of paper currency is not upon the whole hurtful, but the benefit of this is beyond all queſtion. We ſhall afterwards compare the advantages and diſadvantages of paper money; but at preſent let us leave out the conſideration of the evil that it does, and it is manifeſt that there is ſo great a facility and ſafety in the tranſportation of paper above that of gold and ſilver, that it muſt greatly expedite all mercantile tranſactions, internal and external. Suppoſe one hundred thouſand pounds were to be tranſported but three hundred miles, if it were to be carried in ſilver, what an immenſe load would it be? But beſides the weight, as it could not be concealed, there would be a very great riſk of inviting robbers to ſhare in it. Let it be carefully obſerved, that this good effect of paper is not from the additional quantity thrown into circulation, but from its poſſeſſing ſome advantages ſuperior to gold and ſilver, provided that the credit of it is ſupported. Nor muſt it be forgotten, that it is in great and extenſive negociations only, that this advantage is poſſeſſed by paper; for in ſmaller bargains and that intercourſe between man and man that is carried on every hour, it poſſeſſes no advantage at all; on the contrary, it is liable to wear and waſte, and therefore the ſmaller coins are in all reſpects to be preferred.

2. Another uſe of paper in commerce is to extend credit. Though in very large tranſactions the advantage of paper may be great, as it facilitates commerce; yet when we conſider paper as generally circulating, and doing the office of gold and ſilver, it is by the extenſion of credit only, or chiefly, that it can be of any advantage. It is unneceſſary for me, and perhaps not in my power, to mention all the ways in which credit may be increaſed or facilitated by paper. Some will probably be mentioned afterwards; at preſent my buſineſs is to ſhow, that giving credit is one of the advantages, and indeed in my opinion it is the principle advantage, to be derived from paper circulation of any kind. There are many people whoſe induſtry is damped or limited by want of ſtock or credit, who if they were properly aſſiſted in theſe reſpects, might do ſignal ſervice to themſelves, and the community

of which they are members. It has been generally said, and I believe with truth, that the institution of the banks in Scotland has improved the country in the course of little more than half a century, to a degree that is hardly credible. It is also probable, that the manufactures and commerce of England have been greatly promoted by the easy and regular methods of obtaining credit from the public and private banks. I am sensible that some very intelligent persons in Britain have condemned the paper circulation even there, and affirmed that it does more harm than good. It is not necessary for me to enter into the arguments on either side of that question. All that I am concerned to prove is, that if it does good upon the whole, or whatever good it does in any degree, arises from the credit which it is the occasion of extending; and this I think can hardly be denied.*

Let us next consider the evil that is done by paper. This is what I would particularly request the reader to attend to, as it was what this discourse was chiefly intended to evince, and what the public seems but little aware of. The evil is this: All paper introduced into circulation, and obtaining credit as gold and silver, adds to the quantity of the medium, and thereby, as has been shown above, increases the price of industry and its fruits.† This

* That I may state the matter with fairness and fulness, I will just observe, that the enemies of paper say, the improvement was only coeval with the banks, but not caused by them in whole, nor in any great degree. The banks happened to be nearly coeval with the revolution, and the union of England and Scotland; both which important events are supposed to have been causes of improvement to Scotland. However the experience of the last thirty or forty years appears to be considerably in favor of banks and dealers in money and bills, which I consider as essentially the same.

† This will perhaps be misapprehended by some readers. They will say, a high price for our industry! This is just what we want, and what all desire. But the price I mean here is not the price which you get for your industry, but that which you pay for it. A high price, by a great demand from foreign nations, is your profit; but the cost which you pay for servants, tools, rent of land, &c. lessens that profit, and it is this which is increased by increasing the circulating medium, and

conſequence is unavoidable, and follows as certainly from good paper as bad, or rather more certainly, for the medium is increaſed only by that which obtains credit. At the ſame time this conſequence is local, becauſe the paper does not paſs among other nations, and therefore it works againſt the intereſt of the people who uſe it, and neceſſarily draws off their gold and ſilver, which muſt be made uſe of in all foreign payments. Men may think what they pleaſe, but there is no contending with the nature of things. Experience has every where juſtified the remark, that wherever paper is introduced in large quantities, the gold and ſilver vaniſhes univerſally. The joint ſum of gold, ſilver, and paper current, will exactly repreſent your whole commodities, and the prices will be accordingly. It is therefore as if you were to fill a veſſel brim full, making half the quantity water and the other oil, the laſt being ſpecifically lighteſt, will be at the top, and if you add more water, the oil only will run over, and continue running till there is none left. How abſurd and contemptible then is the reaſoning which we have of late ſeen frequently in print, viz. the gold and ſilver is going away from us, therefore we muſt have paper to ſupply its place. If the gold and ſilver is indeed going away from us, that is to ſay, if the balance of trade is much againſt us, the paper medium has a direct tendency to increaſe the evil, and ſend it away by a quicker pace.

I have ſaid, that this conſequence follows from all paper, as ſuch, good and bad, ſo far as it enters into circulation; but every one muſt perceive that there is a peculiar and indeed a different evil to be feared from paper of a doubtful kind, and eſpecially from that which being doubtful, is obliged to be ſupported by coercive laws. This muſt raiſe general ſuſpicion, and conſequently bring on a ſtagnation of commerce, from univerſal and mutual diſtruſt. For the ſame reaſon it muſt annihiliate credit, and

not the other. Make as much money as you pleaſe, this will not make foreign nations call for any more of your grain, fiſh lumber, tobacco, rice, &c. but it will juſt as certainly make them coſt you more before you can bring them to the market, as adding two to three will make five.

make every cautious perſon lock up his real money, that is, gold and ſilver, as he cannot tell but he may be cheated in the re-payment. This evil is very extenſive indeed, for it makes people ſuſpicious, not only of what is, but what may be. Though the injury ſhould be but partial, or inconſiderable at preſent, it may become wholly ruinous by ſome unknown future law.

Hence it may be ſeen, that the reſolution of the queſtion, whether it is proper to have paper money at all or not, depends entirely upon another, viz. whether the evil that is done by augmenting the circulating medium, is or is not over-balanced by the facility given to commerce, and the credit given to particular perſons, by which their induſtry and exertions are added to the common ſtock. As it is upon this that the queſtion depends, we ſhall find, that as the circumſtances of a nation may be different, it may be for or againſt its intereſt to uſe a paper medium. If any nation were in ſuch circumſtances as that credit were either not neceſſary or eaſily obtained; if the country were fully ſettled and the inhabitants fully employed in agriculture, manufactures, and internal commerce, with little foreign trade, any addition to the true money, would be unneceſſary or pernicious. This is probably the ſtate of China at preſent, perhaps in ſome degree alſo of France. On the contrary, if a nation had an extenſive and complicated commerce, and much land to ſettle and improve, the facilitating of commerce, and extending of credit, might be highly beneficial. I do not pretend to ſo exact a knowledge of the ſtate of this country, or the different parts of it, as to judge with abſolute certainty of what is neceſſary or would be uſeful to it, but am inclined to think that there muſt be ſomething in the ſtate of things in America that makes it either more neceſſary or more expedient to have paper here than in the European ſtates. We are aſſured that in former times many of the ſtates, then colonies, thought it a privilege to be allowed to ſtrike paper money; and we are told by perſons of good underſtanding, that it contributed to their growth and improvement. If this was the caſe, I am confident it was chiefly becauſe it was emitted in the way of a loan-office, and by

giving credit to husbandmen, accelerated the settlement and improvement of the soil. This question I do not take upon me to decide, and therefore in what follows, desire I may be considered as speaking only hypothetically, the rather, that at present the inclination after paper of some kind or another seems to be so strong, that it would be in vain to withstand it.

If therefore paper is to be employed in circulation, we may see from what has been said above, what are the principles on which it ought to be conducted, the ends that ought to be aimed at, and the evils that ought to be avoided. The ends to be aimed at are, the facilitating of commercial transactions, and extending of credit to those who are likely to make a proper use of it. The plan should be so conceived, as that the increase of the circulating medium should be as little as possible, consistently with these ends. It should be perfectly secure, so as to create an absolute confidence. And as it is of the nature of an obligation, no force whatever should be used, but the reception of it left entirely to the inclination and interest of the receiver. It may be safely affirmed, that any deviation from these principles, which are deduced from the theory above laid down, will be an essential defect in the system. If we inquire what sort of paper will best answer this description, we find that there is no other sort used in Europe than that of banking companies. The government stamping paper to pass current for coin is unknown there. Notwithstanding the immense sums which have been borrowed by the English government, they always prefer paying interest for them, to issuing paper without value for money. The only thing resembling it in the English history is, James the second coining base metal, and affixing a price to it by proclamation; a project contemptible in the contrivance, and abortive in the execution. This seems to be a considerable presumption, that the measure is upon the whole not eligible.*

* It seems to me, that those who cry out for emitting paper money by the legislatures, should take some pains to state clearly the difference between this and the European countries, and point out the reasons why it would be serviceable here,

The paper of banking companies has many advantages. It is conſidered as perfectly ſafe, becauſe it can be exchanged for gold and ſilver at any time upon demand. Having this ſecurity at bottom, it is perfectly convenient for tranſportation, which indeed is common to it with all paper. In addition to this, it is conſidered as the principal buſineſs of all banks to give credit, which, though directly only in favor of commercial, is ultimately uſeful to many different claſſes of men. I may upon this obſerve, that it is the duty of banking companies ſo to conduct their operations as to extend their regular credit as far as is ſafe for themſelves. If inſtead of this, as has been ſuppoſed at leaſt to have been done by ſome banks in Britain, they circulate their notes by agents, making purchaſes in different and diſtant places, that the ſum iſſued may very far exceed the ſum neceſſary to be kept for probable demands; they are in that caſe not ſerving the public at all, but uſing the money of other people to their own profit. It is alſo to be obſerved, that the denomination of their notes ſhould never be very ſmall, it ſhould indeed be as high as is conſiſtent with ſuch a general uſe as will bring in a ſufficient profit. Very ſmall denominations of paper do the greateſt injury by entering into univerſal circulation, and chiefly affecting the induſtrious part of the community. It was a very great complaint againſt ſome banks in Scotland, what they brought down the denominations of their notes as far as ten ſhillings, and ſome of them even five ſhillings. If this was an evil, what ſhall we ſay of paper, as has been ſeen in this country, as low as one ſhilling, ſix pence, or even three pence value? It is a rule that will hardly admit of any exception, that the higher the denominations of paper bills, the greater the benefit and the leſs the evil; and on the contrary, the ſmaller the denominations, the greater the evil and the leſs the benefit. High ſums in paper obligations may perhaps change hands once a week, but a ſhilling or ſix-penny ticket may be in fifty hands in one day.

and hurtful there; or elſe inſiſt that it would be a wiſe meaſure every where, and recommend the uſe of it to the ſtates of England, France, Holland, &c. who will be much indebted to them for the diſcovery.

I muſt mention here what has been often objected againſt banks in America, which, if juſt, would, from the reaſoning in the preceding part of this diſcourſe, tend to their condemnation. It is, that they have deſtroyed credit inſtead of extending it, and have introduced or given occaſion to exceſſive uſury. I am not ſufficiently informed to ſay how far this is really the caſe, but cannot help obſerving, that treating the matter theoretically, as I have all along done, and conſidering the nature of the thing, this does not appear to be a neceſſary conſequence. One would rather think that the regular credit which is or ought to be given by banks ſhould prevent uſury, by ſupplying all thoſe who deſerve to be truſted. Agreeably to this it was found in fact, that the inſtitution of banks in Scotland lowered the intereſt of money, which indeed ſeems to be the natural effect of every ſuch inſtitution, from the increaſed circulation. But if any inſtances more than before have happened of this kind, it may be by perſons in extreme neceſſity applying to others who have credit with the bank, and who have ſo little conſcientious ſcruple as to take advantage of their neighbor's poverty. If this is the caſe, it is only a particular abuſe, or occaſional bad conſequence of a thing otherwiſe good and uſeful. It is not a juſt objection againſt any thing, that it may be or has been in ſome inſtances abuſed. Beſides, as it is the duty of every banking company to guard againſt this evil as much as poſſible, even by perſonal reſentment, againſt thoſe who make this uſe of their confidence, ſo it is an evil not out of the reach of legal puniſhment or general infamy. Wiſe and well executed laws againſt uſury, would at leaſt ſo far reſtrain it, as to make it an evil of little conſequence.

But in examining the nature and operation of different kinds of paper, I muſt conſider an objection of much greater importance, upon the principles of this diſcourſe, againſt the paper of banks, or at leaſt, a defect in their ſyſtem, that ſeems to call for other meaſures in addition to it. This is, that banking companies give credit only ſo as to be ſerviceable to merchants, and thoſe immediately connected with them, but do not extend it to huſbandmen, or

thoſe who improve the ſoil, by taking mortgages for a conſiderable time; yet according to the theory above laid down, this is not only one of the advantages, but perhaps the chief advantage to be derived from a paper circulation of any kind. Now, I admit, that the ſettlement and cultivation of the ſoil is the radical ſource of the proſperity of this country. It is indeed the ſource of the proſperity of every country, but comparatively more ſo of that of this country than moſt others. I alſo admit that credit, properly extended, to induſtrious perſons in this way would be exceedingly beneficial. For this reaſon, and for this alone, Dr. Franklin and others perhaps judged right when they ſaid, the country received great benefit from the loan office paper of former times. I am alſo ſenſible, that it is not practicable nor proper for banking companies to give credit upon mortgages on diſtant lands. They being bound to prompt payment, muſt expect the ſame; therefore they are not to be blamed for refuſing it in this form*. For all theſe reaſons, I do not take upon me wholly to condemn a meaſure in America, which would be unneceſſary or improper in Europe. We hear from every quarter, that is to ſay, from almoſt every ſtate, a loud cry for paper money. Now when there is a great and univerſal complaint, it is ſeldom without ſome foundation; and though I have taken much pains in the preceding diſcourſe to ſhow that they miſtake their own wants, that they do not want a circulating medium, but uſe that phraſe without underſtanding its meaning; yet they certainly do want ſomething. They want particular *credit;* and they look back with deſire to the former times when they had paper money, which, by its name itſelf, pointed out its nature and uſe, the notes being then called bills of credit. I will therefore proceed, keeping a ſteady eye upon the principles above laid down, to ſtate

* I muſt here obſerve, that the banks of Scotland never gave credit upon mortgages, but perſonal ſecurity only, and yet they were univerſally ſuppoſed to put it in the power of landed men to improve their eſtates; ſo that the money tranſactions muſt have been, though not directly, yet remotely in their favor.

in what manner a loan-office may be eſtabliſhed* within moderate bounds, that ſhall render a ſervice probably greater than the evils neceſſarily conſequent upon it.

I would therefore propoſe, that any ſtate that thinks it neceſſary, ſhould emit a ſum of ſuppoſe one hundred thouſand pounds, and that the following rules ſhould be laid down in the law, and invariably adhered to. (1.) That not a ſhilling of that money ſhould iſſue from the loan-office treaſury, but upon mortgage of land to the amount of double the ſum in value. (2.) That it ſhould not be a legal tender for any debts contracted or to be contracted, but receivable in all taxes within the ſtate, and payable for the wages of Council and Aſſembly, and the fees and perquiſites of all public officers, after it has been ſo received. (3.) That at the end of twelve calender months, a ſum preciſely equal to the intereſt that had accrued or become due in that time, ſhould be conſumed by fire, and public intimation given of its being done. The ſame thing ſhould be done every ſubſequent year. (4.) That at no time any part of this money ſhould be made uſe of in the payment of the public debts, but that which had been firſt levied in taxes. It would not be proper even to borrow from the ſtock for this purpoſe by anticipation†.

If theſe rules were obſerved, credit would be given to

* I am not ignorant that there has been in one of our ſtates, I mean Pennſylvania, a violent controverſy for and againſt the bank, between the political factions which divide that ſtate. On this account, I am ſorry I was obliged to mention banks at all; but it was impoſſible for me to do juſtice to the ſubject, without conſidering their general nature and effects; and I will not ſo much as name any of the arguments on either ſide of this queſtion, but what is neceſſarily connected with money in general as a currency, and its effects upon the national intereſt.

† The paying of the public creditors is one of the moſt common and popular arguments for paper emiſſions, but to pay them with money not loaned, is not paying, but continuing the debt upon the ſtate, and only make it change hands. All ſuch bills ſo paid muſt be accounted for by the public. It is better, therefore, that by the loans men may be enabled eaſily to pay their taxes; and then let the public creditors be paid by money demanded equally from the whole for that purpoſe.

ſome perſons, who needed and deſerved it, to the amount of the whole ſum. The bills current would be diminiſhed in quantity every year ſo as not to load the circulation, which would have a ſenſible effect upon the public opinion, and indeed, from the nature of the thing, would increaſe their value, or rather confirm it from year to year*. At the end of fourteen or fifteen years they would be wholly taken out of circulation, and that not by any tax laid on for the purpoſe, but by the hire or uſe of the money itſelf, and after all, the principal ſum would be ſtill due to the ſtate in good money, which might bear intereſt for ever. It would be an important addition to this ſcheme, if no bills leſs than two dollars, or perhaps three, or five, ſhould be emitted, as this would ſtill keep ſilver at leaſt in circulation. On the above principles, all the good that can be produced by paper would be effected, viz. facilitating commerce, and giving credit; and as little of the evil as poſſible, becauſe the quantity would be fixed and moderate at firſt, and continually decreaſing, ſo as at laſt to vaniſh altogether; and then another emiſſion of the ſame kind might be made, if the utility of the firſt ſhould recommend it.

Perhaps it will be ſaid, that this money not being a legal tender, would not anſwer the purpoſe of borrowers by paying their debts, nor get at all into circulation. To this I anſwer, that it would not anſwer the purpoſe of thoſe who want to pay their debts with half nothing, and cheat their creditors; nor do I wiſh to ſee any thing attempted that would produce that effect. But I affirm, that it would get better into circulation than by a tender law, which creates general and juſt ſuſpicion. Tender laws, as has been already proved, may be made uſe

* I cannot help obſerving here, that the titles of moſt of the acts for emitting money, do unawares confeſs the juſtice of all that has been ſaid above; they run thus, "An act for emitting —— thouſand pounds in bills of credit, and directing the manner of *ſinking the ſame.*" Does not this ſhow what ſort of a circulating medium they are? Does it not admit, that they will do evil if they continue to circulate? When you coin gold and ſilver, do you provide for ſinking it?

of by deceitful perſons to do particular acts of injuſtice, but are not ſufficient to procure general circulation, nor to excite and reward induſtry, without the opinion and approbation of the public. Such money as I have deſcribed would excite no alarm, it might eaſily be tried. It would, in my opinion, certainly be tried, for all would know that it would pay every tax to government, and even borrowers of large ſums might make trial of it, without any riſk at all, becauſe, if it would not anſwer their end, they might, after a few months, repay it, and take up their mortgage. But I cannot help thinking that the principles of it are ſo juſt, and the plan ſo certain, that all underſtanding perſons would perceive and approve it.

I muſt here take the occaſion and the liberty of ſaying, that it were greatly to be wiſhed that thoſe who have in their hands the adminiſtration of affairs in the ſeveral ſtates of America, would take no meaſures, either on this, or any other ſubject, but what are founded upon juſtice, ſupported by reaſon, and warranted to be ſafe by the experience of former ages, and of other countries. The operation of political cauſes is as uniform and certain as that of natural cauſes. And any meaſure which in itſelf has a bad tendency, though its effects may not be inſtantly diſcernable, and their progreſs may be but ſlow, yet it will be infallible; and perhaps the danger will then only appear when a remedy is impoſſible. This is the caſe, in ſome degree, with all political meaſures, without exception, yet I am miſtaken if it is not eminently ſo with reſpect to commercial dealings. Commerce is excited, directed, and carried on by intereſt. But do not miſtake this, it is not carried on by general univerſal intereſt, nor even by well informed national intereſt, but by immediate, apparent, and ſenſible perſonal intereſt. I muſt alſo obſerve, that there is in mankind a ſharp-ſightedneſs upon this ſubject that is quite aſtoniſhing.

All men are not philoſophers, but they are generally good judges of their own profit in what is immediately before them, and will uniformly adhere to it. It is not uncommon to ſee a man who appears to be almoſt as

ſtupid as a ſtone, and yet he ſhall be as adroit and dextrous in making a bargain, or even more ſo, than a man of the firſt rate underſtanding, who, probably, for that very reaſon, is leſs attentive to trifling circumſtances, and leſs under the government of mean and ſelfiſh views. As to currency, which has been our general ſubject, if coins of any particular ſpecies happen, as is ſometimes the caſe, to paſs at a rate, ever ſo little higher, in one country, or corner of a country than another, thither they will immediately direct their courſe; and if the matter is not attended to, nor the miſtake rectified, they will be all there in a very ſhort time, and the place which receives them muſt bear the loſs.

I will now ſum up, in ſingle propoſitions, the ſubſtance of what has been aſſerted, and I hope ſufficiently proved, in the preceding diſcourſe.

(1.) It ought not to be imputed to accident or caprice, that gold, ſilver, and copper, formerly were, and the two firſt continue to be, the medium of commerce; but to their inherent value, joined with other properties, that fit them for circulation. Therefore, all the ſpeculations, formed upon a contrary ſuppoſition, are inconcluſive and abſurd.

(2.) Gold and ſilver are far from being in too ſmall quantity at preſent for the purpoſe of a circulating medium, in the commercial nations. The laſt of them, viz. ſilver, ſeems rather to be in too great quantity, ſo as to become inconvenient for tranſportation.

(3.) the people of every nation will get the quantity of theſe precious metals, that they are entitled to by their induſtry, and no more. If by any accident, as plunder in war, or borrowing from other nations, or even finding it in mines, they get more, they will not be able to keep it. It will in a ſhort time, find its level. Laws againſt exporting the coin will not prevent this. Laws of this kind, though they are ſtill in force in ſome nations, ſuppoſed to be wiſe, yet are in themſelves ridiculous. If you import more than you export, you muſt pay the balance, or give up the trade.

(4.) The quantity of gold and ſilver at any time in a nation, is no evidence of national wealth, unleſs you take into conſideration the way in which it came there, and the probability of its continuing.

(5.) No paper of any kind is, properly ſpeaking, money. It ought never to be made a legal tender. It *ought* not to be forced upon *any* body, becauſe it *cannot* be forced upon *every* body.

(6.) Gold and ſilver, fairly acquired, and likely to continue, are real national, as well as perſonal wealth. If twice as much paper circulates with them, though in full credit, particular perſons may be rich by poſſeſſing it, but the nation in general is not.

(7.) The cry of the ſcarcity of money, is generally putting the effect for the cauſe. No buſineſs can be done, ſay ſome, becauſe money is ſcarce. It may be ſaid with more truth, money is ſcarce, becauſe little buſineſs is done. Yet their influence, like that of many other cauſes, and effects, is reciprocal.

(8.) The quantity of current money, of whatever kind, will have an effect in raiſing the price of induſtry, and bringing goods dearer to market, therefore the increaſe of the currency in any nation, by paper, which will not paſs among other nations, makes the firſt coſt of every thing they do greater, and of conſequence, the profit leſs.

(9.) It is however poſſible, that paper obligations may ſo far facilitate commerce, and extend credit, as by the additional induſtry, that they excite, to over-balance the injury which they do in other reſpects. Yet even the good itſelf may be over-done. Too much money may be emitted even upon loan, but to emit money any other way, than upon loan, is to do all evil and no good.

(10.) The exceſſive quantity of paper emitted by the different ſtates of America, will probably be a loſs to the whole. They cannot however take advantage of one another in that way. That ſtate which emits moſt will loſe moſt, and *vice versa.*

(11.) I can ſee no way in which it can do good but one, which is to deter other nations from truſting us, and thereby leſſen our importations; and I ſincerely wiſh, that

in that way, it may prove in some degree a remedy for its own evils.

(12.) Those who refuse doubtful paper, and thereby disgrace it, or prevent its circulation, are not enemies, but friends to their country.

To draw to a conclusion, it is probable that those who perceive, which it will be easy to do, that the author of this tract is not a merchant or trader, by profession, will be ready to say, what has this gentleman to do with such a subject? Why should he write upon what he has no practical knowledge of, money and commerce? To these I answer, that I have written, not as a merchant, but as a scholar. I profess to derive my opinions from the best civilians of this and the last age, and from the history of all ages, joined with a pretty considerable experience and attention to the effects of political causes, within the sphere of my own observation. It is not even too much to say, that one of the mercantile profession, unless his views were very enlarged indeed, is not so proper to handle a general subject of this kind as some others. His attention is usually confined to the business, and to the branch of that business in which he is employed. In that his discernment will be clear, and he will find out, if possible, where he can buy cheapest, and sell dearest. But as to the theory of commerce, or the great objects of national interest or connexion, he can have no advantage at all over a person given to study and reflection, who has some acquaintance with public life. With these remarks, by way of apology, and having no interest in the matter but what is common to every citizen, I freely commit the whole to the judgment of the impartial public.

SPEECH

IN THE

Synod of Glasgow,

When I was accused of being the Author of the Ecclesiastical Characteristics.

MODERATOR,

IT cannot but give me ſome pain to think upon my being obliged to ſtand at your bar, in ſome ſort as a pannel or accuſed perſon. At the ſame time, this is greatly alleviated, by the conſideration that I am now called to a regular defence of my character, which has been long abuſed in the moſt virulent manner, when I had no opportunity of ſpeaking for myſelf. But Sir, before coming to the particular objection which has been pleaded before you, it is neceſſary that I ſhould endeavor to remove the great odium that has been, by ſome in the world, induſtriouſly thrown upon me. Thoſe gentlemen at the bar, by whom I am now conſtrained to this apology, perhaps know who it was that taught certain perſons who knew nothing of me, to repreſent me as a firebrand, as violent and contentious, unfit to be a member of any quiet ſociety. This is a character, Sir, which I am moſt unwilling to bear, and which, if I am not greatly miſtaken,

is moſt unjuſtly imputed to me, from any paſt part of my conduct. I call upon all thoſe with whom I have lived many years in Preſbytery, to ſay if they will lay this to my charge. The apoſtle James tells us, that "if any "man offend not in word, the ſame is a perfect man."— Perfection I do not plead; but any comparative guilt in this reſpect, I do abſolutely refuſe. I call particularly upon my neareſt neighbor, a miniſter and co-preſbyter, who ought ſurely to be an unſuſpected witneſs, becauſe we have hardly ever agreed in any principle of church government; yet there hath not been the leaſt jealouſy or dryneſs between us as men, nor even as Chriſtians or miniſters; and yet difference in opinion has often cauſed ſuch things between very good men. I have alſo, Sir, been many times a member of this Synod, ſometimes when debates were pretty high, and may ſafely affirm, that I have been as far from indiſcretion and violence as any of thoſe who accuſe me. I was none of thoſe, in April 1753, who, in the committee of overtures, ſpun out the time purpoſely with long ſpeeches till the ſynod's hour was come, and then would not ſuffer the committee to come to any deciſion; but unleſs the ſynod were immediately conſtituted, threatened, with apparent paſſion and fury, to withdraw, and conſtitute a ſeparate ſynod altogether. Probably Mr. P——, and Mr. M——, may be able to inform you who the perſons were; and I aſſure you from my own knowledge, that ſuch conduct in clergymen was very aſtoniſhing and offenſive to ſome of the laity. I have been told that at the admiſſion of the Rev. Mr. Baine, in Paiſley, the perſon who admitted him, among other advices, told him to beware of a party ſpirit; and in this, another member ſaid he ſpoke the ſenſe of the whole preſbytery. I am convinced there are ſome perſons who by a party ſpirit mean a perſon having different principles from themſelves, and that no meekneſs of temper, no purity of character, no humanity in his carriage, will in that caſe, ſave an opponent from ſuch an imputation. And if by a party ſpirit be underſtood a regard to the perſon as much as the cauſe, and proſecuting their own purpoſes in a violent and illegal manner, without candor or charity to thoſe who

differ from them, I know none who have a juſter title to the character than ſome members of that reverend body. Several inſtances might be given in their paſt conduct to juſtify this obſervation; ſome of which perhaps I ſhall afterwards mention; the reſt are well enough known, and indeed, it ſeems to be generally agreed by the world about them, that they are not over patient of mixture.

This, Sir, very plainly appears from the caſe now before you. This preſbytery have refuſed leave to grant even a call to me, upon a preſentation and unanimous application from all concerned; and aſſign this reaſon for it, that there is a report of my being author of a book which they ſay in their minutes is of a very bad tendency to the intereſts of religion, and injurious to the characters of many miniſters of this church, and therefore they appointed a committee, &c. The injury done to the town of Paiſley, it is the buſineſs of the congregation to complain of, and they have done it, and wait for redreſs from you. The injury done to me, I beg leave, in a few words, to repreſent to this venerable Synod.—And here, Sir, I do not complain of their taking into conſideration any book that they ſhall be pleaſed to think contrary to the intereſts of Religion, and ſhould have been well ſatisfied to hear of a motion for cenſuring irreligious books come from that quarter.—I wiſh if ever it come from any quarter they may faithfully inſpect it. But ſir, I complain that they have joined my name to a certain book with which they are not pleaſed, and then have paſſed a ſentence condemning it, when I was not and could not regularly be before them. This is a caſe that may have important conſequences. All I deſire is equity and juſtice, and that ſurely I have a right to claim. The preſbytery of Paiſley, Sir, had a right to accuſe me if they pleaſed before the preſbytery of which I am a member. But they had no right at all to condemn, or even to judge me, themſelves, and much leſs when I was not heard.—Perhaps it will be ſaid they have not found me guilty, but propoſed a peaceable manner of trying whether I was ſo or not; but Sir, have they not found by their ſentence the relevancy of the crime, againſt which, as well as the proof, any accuſed perſon has a right to be heard.

The injury they have done me, and the unjuſt and tyrannical method of their proceedings, appear in the moſt evident manner from the ſituation in which I now ſtand, and the manner of the cauſe being pleaded before you—You ſee with what difficulty they were hindred, or rather that they could not be hindered, from entering into the merits of the cauſe, and endeavoring to perſuade the Synod to condemn this book to which they have joined my name, before they have ſo much as let me know the nature and form of the proceſs againſt me, and when I have had no opportunity to ſee and anſwer their charge.—This is againſt all rule, for by the form of proceſs it ought to have begun at the preſbytery of Irvine; and whether it be taken up upon the footing of a *fama clamosa*, or a libel from a particular accuſer, there muſt ſtill be virtually a libel in the view of the court—But by bringing it in here, in the manner they have done, and pleading upon it, they are endeavoring to get a law made, as it were *ex post facto*, upon which I may be condemned hereafter; and they have reduced me to the neceſſity of pleading in defence of a book with which I do not, nor ever did pretend any connexion, unleſs I would give a ſanction to a method of proceeding pregnant with tyranny and injuſtice. So that though I come to the Synod for juſtice it is really hardly poſſible for you fully to grant it, becauſe you cannot wholly underſtand the bad effects of the Preſbytery's wrong procedure. I am ſenſible Sir, that it would be giving up the very point which I am chiefly to plead, if I ſhould enter into the merits of the cauſe ſo far as to conſider the particulars contained in this book; whether they are juſt or unjuſt, true or falſe. But I muſt beg leave to conſider a little in general whether the crime of which they think proper to ſuſpect me was ſo certainly and ſelf-evidently relevant that they might take it for granted, and aſſert it in their minutes, without ſo much as having the book before them, or mentioning the offenſive paſſages; which I ſhould think were neceſſary even in the worſt book that can be conceived—and to all this join my name without ſuffering me to be heard.

And here, sir, I should think that modesty and common decency might have led them to determine otherwise, had they not before themselves the unanimous application of a large and numerous people to call me to be their minister. Did not these people know of the rumour of my being author of this book before they entered into this resolution, and are they all so abandoned as to call an enemy to all rules to watch for their souls? Did not the presbytery know that the person so suspected had been a member of a presbytery for some years after the suspicion began? that he had been a member of this Synod with themselves, nay a member of the Supreme Court of this church, and no notice taken of it all? Nay, are they so ignorant as not to know that a very great majority of this nation find no fault with the book at all? and any person professing himself the author would not thereby in the least degree forfeit their esteem. Pray sir, was it, is it, could it be just in this case, to conclude it criminal without debate or examination? I mean not by this to justify the book in every particular; perhaps if it comes to be examined I may join in condemning it, at least, some parts; but I insist that this shows the precipitateness, the partiality and injustice of the Presbytery, in the sentence which they passed. It looks as if they themselves were struck at in the performance and acted as interested persons; and indeed I would gladly ask them whether they think themselves pointed at in the pamphlet; and if they think so, and at the same time ascribe it to me, whether it is just and equitable that they should be my judges who are supposed to be aggrieved?

There is another general consideration that shews how unjust and precipitate this sentence was, and that there is really no belief of the thing being so criminal as they have taken for granted, among those who must be most unprejudiced and impartial judges. It is read in England, and the presbytery of Paisley do or may know, the sentiments that are entertained of it there. I have been well informed that the present Bishop of London, in conversation with a Nobleman of our own country, gave it great commendation; and withal added, it seems only directed

at a certain party in the church of Scotland, but we want not very many in the Church of England, to whom the characters are very applicable. And Sir, I have seen a letter from the Rev. Mr. Warburton to a minister in Scotland, and it has been seen by several ministers here present, in which he commends the performance, and particularly calls it a fine piece of raillery against a party, to which says he, we are no strangers here—Is it to be supposed sir, that distinguished persons for worth and penetration, would commend and approve a thing so evidently criminal as the presbytery of Paisley are pleased to think—Are persons of the character there represented to be found in the Church of England? Where then is the Church of Scotland's charter of security that none shall ever arise in her deserving such a reprimand? shall such names as these mentioned openly affirm that there are such in England? and must the man be condemned without hearing and without mercy who is but suspected of hinting that there may be such in her sister church? I have often indeed since the commencement of this business reflected on the different situation of affairs in Scotland and England. I have seen, I know not how many books in England, printed with the authors names, which plainly and without ambiguity affirm that there are some of the clergy proud, ambitious, time-servers, and tools to those in power; some of them lazy and slothful, lovers of ease and pleasure; some of them scandalous and dissolute in their manners; some ignorant and insufficient. And these things they affirm without the least danger, or apprehension of it: but I believe, were I to publish a book that had the tenth part of such severity in it in Scotland, I ought at the same time to have a ship hired to flee to another country. I shall not pretend to account for this difference, but only affirm, and I am myself a standing evidence, that it doth really subsist. And at the same time it is attended by a very odd circumstance, for reproaches are criminal when thrown out by one set against the other, but not in the least so, when thrown out, or thrown back, by that other against the first—Many here present will remember what a set of overtures were brought into this Synod in April 1753, by

ſome of the very perſons who are now ſtanding at the bar; one of them ſet forth the grievous crime of bringing our public differences with one another into the pulpit: and yet, ſtrange to think, the only ſermon that ever I heard in my life in which this was done, was by one of my preſent accuſers, who, Sir, fell bloodily upon thoſe miniſters who bawl out againſt the law of the land as a grievance, inſtead of giving it that obedience which becomes good ſubjects. It indeed was his ignorance to find fault with that expreſſion, which is uſed even by the ſacred infallible General Aſſembly, in the annual inſtructions to their commiſſioners. Is it not alſo well known, that a pamphlet was publiſhed, called "The Juſt View of the Conſtitution," which common, uncontradicted fame, which is not my caſe, attributes to Mr. H————, and publiſhed many months before the one for which I am now accuſed. This pamphlet repreſents us all in general as not acting upon conſcience, but from a love of popularity, or in the words of the ingenious Mr. T—— of Gowan, "not conſcience, but a ſpirit of faction and a love of dominion." And beſides this, it tells a ſtory, which it calls a ſcene of iniquity, with the initial letters of the names of the perſons concerned. Was ever this pamphlet charged by theſe gentlemen, my opponents, as contrary to the intereſt of religion? At the ſame time, I ſhould be glad to know what it is that makes the diſcovery of a ſcene of iniquity, if committed by ſome whom I muſt not name, contrary to the intereſt of religion; but the diſcovery of a ſcene of iniquity, ſuppoſed to be committed by Mr. Webſter, or ſome others of us, nothing contrary to it at all. I am not able to diſcover any reaſon for this difference of judgment, but one that is not very honorable to them, viz. Theſe ſcenes of iniquity, ſuppoſed to be committed by them, are more probable in themſelves, and actually obtain more credit, than thoſe which they throw out againſt us. I do not affirm that that is the reaſon, but I think, ſince they have been the aggreſſors, both in cenſuring us for ſcrupling obedience to ſome of their deciſions and attacking our characters in print, if ſome nameleſs author has with great ſucceſs retaliated the injury of the laſt kind,

they ought to lie as quietly under it as poſſible, both from equity and prudence—from equity becauſe they have given the provocation; from prudence, becauſe it will bring many to ſay, that charge muſt have been juſt, or it would have been treated with contempt.—Surely that ſtroke muſt have been well aimed—the wound muſt have been very deep, ſince the ſcar continues ſo long, and is never like to be either forgotten or forgiven.

But, Sir, I muſt confeſs I am amazed at the boldneſs, as well as the violence of thoſe gentlemen, conſidering the land in which we live. Is it not, and do we not glory in its being a land of liberty? Is it then a land of civil liberty and yet of eccleſiaſtical tyranny? Muſt not a man have equity and juſtice in the church, as well as the ſtate? Are there not every day publiſhed in this nation, as ſevere, nay much ſeverer cenſures of the greateſt characters in the kingdom, and poſſeſſing the higheſt offices? Are there not attacks upon our ſovereign himſelf, and his auguſt family, many times made in print, and yet paſſed unheeded? And muſt the leaſt attempt to ſhow that there are corruptions among the clergy be an unpardonable crime? I have ſeen it inſiſted on in print, that as ſoon as the liberty of the preſs is taken away, there is an end of every ſhadow of liberty. And as of late years it hath been very frequent to borrow from what is cuſtomary in the civil government, and apply it to the church, I ſhall beg leave to borrow this maxim, and to affirm, that ſo ſoon as it is not permitted in general to laſh the characters of churchmen, there is eſtabliſhed a ſacerdotal tyranny, which always was, and always will be, of the moſt cruel, relentleſs, and illegal kind. But the worſt of all is ſtill behind, which I am aſhamed to mention in the preſence of ſo many of the laity, becauſe of the reproach which it brings upon our church. There have been publiſhed among us, writings directly levelled againſt religion itſelf, taking away the very foundation of morality, bringing in doubt the being of God, and treating our Redeemer's name with contempt and deriſion. Writings of this kind have been publicly avowed, with the author's name prefixed. Where has been the zeal of the Preſbytery of Paiſley againſt ſuch

writings? Have they moved for the exercise of discipline against the authors? Have they supported the motion when made by others? I am afraid, Sir, this prosecution will give many just ground to say, as was said an age ago by Moliere in France, and by some there upon occasion of his writings, that a man may write against God Almighty what he pleases, in perfect security; but if he write against the characters of the clergy in power, he is ruined for ever.

I am sensible, Sir that they have said, even at this bar, as indeed they and their emmissaries in conversation have often alledged, that the quarrel they have at the pamphlet, is its hurtful tendency to the interest of religion: nay, they have often said that one who could write in that style and manner against his brethren, cannot possibly be a good man; and that has been commonly said even upon the supposition of the truth of the facts and characters contained in the book. This, Sir, I would have had nothing to do with, but would have suffered the book to answer for itself, since its author does not think proper to appear in its defence, if they had not been pleased to load me with the suspicion of it. For removing this odium, by which alone it is that they have made an impression on some good men, I observe in general, that it is not conceivable that a thing should be a certain mark of a bad man, which is approved by, and conveys no such idea to, so great a number of unquestionable characters. But besides, let us consider a little the nature of the thing—1. It is written ironically. 2. It is supposed to attack the characters and credit of a part of the clergy of the church of Scotland. As to the first of these, far be it from me to assert that ridicule is the test of truth; many here present know how uniformly, and how strenuously I have maintained the contrary: it is however many times useful to disgrace known falsehood, and such practices as to be despised need only to be exposed; that it is a lawful thing to make such an use of it, is evident from the highest authority. There are many instances of irony in the sacred writings. In Gen. iii. 22. we have an expression put into the mouth of God himself, which many, perhaps most

interpreters, ſuppoſe to be an irony ; and as it is of the moſt ſevere and cutting kind, in a moſt deplorable caſe, ſo I do not ſee that another interpretation can be put upon the words.—" And the Lord God ſaid, behold the man is be-" come as one of us, to know good and evil." The conduct of Elijah, and his treatment of the prophets of Baal, 1 Kings xviii. 27. is another example of the ſame kind; " And it came to paſs at noon, that Elijah mocked them, " and ſaid, Cry aloud : for he is a god, either he is talking, " or he is purſuing, or he is in a journey, or peradven-" ture he ſleepeth, and muſt be awaked." There are a good many inſtances of it in the prophets, Which I omit to ſave time, as the thing is undeniable, and only further mention an expreſſion of our Saviour himſelf, who though a man of ſorrows and in a ſtate of humiliation, yet in ſome places uſes a language plainly ironical, as in John x. 31. " Many good works have I ſhewed you from my " Father, for which of theſe works do ye ſtone me ?"

And as the inſtances of ſuch writing in the word of God ſufficiently warrants the uſe of it, ſo it is founded upon the plaineſt reaſon. There are two diſtinct qualities of truth and piety ; a divine beauty, which renders them amiable, and a holy majeſty, which renders them venerable :—and there are alſo two diſtinct qualities of error and impiety ; a criminal guilt, which renders them the object of horror, and a deluſion and folly, which renders them ſilly and contemptible—and it is fit and proper that the children of God ſhould have both of theſe ſentiments of hatred and contempt with regard to them. And the laſt is often neceſſary, as well as the firſt, in combating corruptions. There is for ordinary, a pride and ſelf-ſufficiency in wicked men, which makes them deaf to advice, and impregnable to ſober and ſerious reaſoning, nor is there any getting at them till there pride is levelled a little with this diſmaying weapon. Many of the ancient fathers of the Chriſtian church, both uſed this manner of writing, and aſſerted its neceſſity. There is one paſſage of Tertullian, which I ſhall tranſlate, becauſe it is very much to the purpoſe. " There are many things which ought to be treated with contempt and mockery, through

fear of giving them weight, and making them too important, by ſeriouſly debating them. Nothing more is due to vanity than deriſion; and it belongs to the truth to ſmile becauſe it is chearful, and to deſpiſe its enemies becauſe it is aſſured of victory. It is true that we ought to be careful that the raillery be not low and unworthy of the truth; but if that is taken care of, and we can make uſe of it with addreſs and delicacy, it is a duty to do ſo." To this I ſhall add another paſſage from St. Auguſtine—"Who will dare to ſay that the truth ought to remain defenceleſs againſt the attacks of falſehood? That the enemies of religion ſhall be permitted to terrify the faithful with ſtrong words, and to entice and ſeduce them by agreeable terms of wit; but that believers ought never to write, but with ſuch a coldneſs of ſtyle as to lull the reader aſleep?"

Enough ſurely has been ſaid in defence of the manner of writing; and as to the ſubject of it, attacking the characters of clergymen, I am altogether at a loſs to know what is that argument in reaſon, or that precept in ſcripture, which makes it criminal to cenſure them, when they deſerve it. That their ſtation, like that of all other perſons of influence or in public employment, ſhould make men very tender and cautious how they take up an evil report againſt them, and never to do it, except upon good ground, I allow; but when the church is really bad, I hold it as a juſt principle, that as it is in them doubly criminal, and doubly pernicious, ſo it ought to be expoſed with double ſeverity. And this is ſo far from being contrary to the intereſts of religion, that nothing can be more honorable to it, than to ſhew that there are ſome ſo bold as to reprove, and ſo faithful as to withſtand, the corruptions of others. How far ſecret wickedneſs ſhould be concealed, and ſcenes of iniquity not laid open, and ſo ſin turned into ſcandal in miniſters, is a matter that would require a very careful and accurate diſcuſſion, and admit of many exceptions; but if in any caſe erroneous doctrine, or degeneracy of life, is plain and viſible, to render them completely odious, muſt be a duty; and when it is not done, it makes men conclude we are all combined together, like

Demetrius and the craftſmen, and more concerned for our own power and credit, than the intereſt and benefit of thoſe committed to our charge. Thoſe who think that no good man can attack the character of the clergy, I would juſt remind of the attack made upon the Jeſuits in France, about one hundred years ago, by the gentlemen of the Port royal, a ſociety of Janſeniſts, of great parts and eminent piety; particularly by Monſieur Paſcal, in his provincial letters, which are written almoſt entirely in the way of ridicule. And the very objection was made againſt them by the Jeſuits at that time, that is now made againſt this piece. Will any man now conclude from them, that Paſcal was a bad man, whom all hiſtory teſtifies to have been as pious and unbiaſſed to the world as any of his time.?

I hope, ſir, what hath been ſaid thus in general, on the ſpecies of writing, and the ſubject of this book, will convince every impartial member of this Synod, that the Preſbytery of Paiſley have acted in a moſt unjuſt and illegal manner, in paſſing the ſentence they have done upon it in my abſence, and without any examination. It is neceſſary that I ſhould now alſo ſpeak a little to the method of enquiry which they reſolved upon, by appointing a committee of their number privately to interrogate me. And indeed, ſir, the method is ſo full of abſurdity and tyranny, that I know not well where to begin in ſpeaking upon it. They have no where indeed told what were to be the conſequences, if their ſuſpicions were found to be juſt. Perhaps the Preſbytery of Paiſley would have paſſed ſentence of depoſition againſt me in my abſence, which would have been but ending as they began, contrary to law and juſtice. But, whatever were their particular intentions, by their violent and illegal ſtretches of power in falling upon it, they were plainly of the worſt kind; and it always put me in mind of a Fryer of the Inquiſition, with an unhappy perſon before them, whom they want to convict, that they may burn him, ſtroking him, and ſaying to him in the ſpirit of meekneſs, Confeſs, my ſon, confeſs.

Sir, if theſe gentlemen ſuppoſed me endued with the leaſt degree of common underſtanding, this method was exceſſively abſurd; and whether they did or not, it was

full of injuſtice. This committee being appointed by the court, and the appointment inſerted on the records of the Preſbytery, I juſt aſk, were they not to make a report to the next meeting of the Preſbytery, of all their private converſation with me? Would not this alſo be ingroſſed in the minutes, and make a part of the proceſs under their cognizance? Could I be preſent at their next meeting, to be the leaſt check or controul upon their report? or would they regard any of my corrections of their committee's report, if I could? In this ſituation, no man of common ſenſe would have had any converſation with them but by writing, ſo that he might be ſure nothing would be reported but his own words. For I would not truſt the moſt impartial perſon in the world to report any converſation with me, upon a matter in which he ſeemed to be keenly intereſted, or to have very different ſentiments from me. The power of prejudice would give a tincture to the repreſentation; nay, the leaſt forgetfulneſs would create ſome variance. And if they ſuppoſed me ſimple enough to converſe with them, what muſt they have been, to take ſuch advantage of my ſimplicity?

Further, ſir, this method of enquiry was very abſurd, becauſe ſelf-contradictory. They load a man with the ſuſpicion of writing a book contrary to the intereſt of religion, and containing many falſhoods; and then they pretend to aſk this man if he had done ſo, ſaying that they will be well ſatisfied if he ſhall deny it. Theſe ſuppoſitions deſtroy one another. If his veracity be ſo entirely to be depended on, either he muſt not be the author of the book, or it is impoſſible it can contain the falſhoods that are alleged: for if he will lie in print to defame his brethren, he will ſurely never ſcruple to lie in converſation to ſave himſelf from ruin. Therefore, ſir, I do affirm, that appointing a committee to confer with me, was highly abſurd, or Jeſuitically cunning. For if my word is ſo much to be depended on as they give out, it is a clear and compleat vindication of me from their charge, and that out of their own mouths. But perhaps they were more cunning than abſurd, and intended firſt to make

me deny the thing formally, and then adduce it as a proof, and to aggravate the crime.

But, sir, they pretend that in this they are only in the spirit, and following the rules of the Gospel; particularly that rule of our Saviour, "If thy brother trespass against thee," &c. It is surprising to hear any speaking in the name of such a body, make use of this argument. I would not give my judgment for having a man to preach the Gospel, who is capable of giving such an interpretation to that text. It evidently and undeniably relates only to private offence or personal injury. "If thy brother "trespass against thee, go and tell him his fault between "thee and him alone; if he hear thee, thou hast gain-"ed thy brother." Here, sir, nobody has any thing to do with it but the person injured; if by confession or reparation, he is satisfied, the matter is ended. But will any man say that this is to be applied to cases public in their nature, and against which, if true, a process and public censure is intended? If any of the Presbytery of Paisley, supposing themselves pointed at in that book, had previously come to me when the report rose; or suppose they had at any time, as private persons, spoke to me on the subject—they would have found no man more ready to commune with them, and give them all satisfaction due from one Christian to another. But, sir, after proceeding as a court in the manner above represented; after illegally finding it criminal, and making it the ground of stopping a settlement; then to appoint a committee privately to interrogate me, as to the fact—it is, in my humble opinion, a violation of justice for them to attempt it, a perversion of the word of God to build it upon that text; and it would be yielding up the natural rights of mankind if I should be so tame as to submit to it.

Again, sir, they pretend that their conduct is exactly conformable to the form of process and the practice founded upon it in the case of other scandals, where the very first means of proof is dealing with the accused person's conscience, to bring him to a confession. And here, sir, I must say, before this Synod, that I am not only humbly willing to stand or fall by this form of process,

but that I am resolved to assert and maintain my right to be judged by it, and by it alone, and not by the arbitrary proceedings of some modern clergymen. A general observation is necessary here, that this form of process doth universally proceed upon scandals, the relevancy of which is acknowledged and cannot be denied. Now, this is by no means the case here, as is evident from my continuing so long in the ministerial character, after the rise of the report, as well as many other considerations suggested above; and therefore, at any rate, the relevancy must be first proved, before there can be any propriety of asking for a confession and dealing with the conscience. It is true, they have in their minutes found the relevancy; but whether this has been according to the rules in the form of process, I could almost allow even themselves to be judges; for I dare say they would hardly do it a second time.

But now, after we have left this in its full force, let us suppose that the matter objected, were only of a scandalous nature, and let us go to the 7th chapter in the form of process concerning ministers, and see whether the method there prescribed has been observed in this case. But, sir, as the whole affair is full of irregularity, and involved in darkness and confusion by the precipitate or artful conduct of the Presbytery; so there is a particular difficulty which arises from the strange and ambiguous light in which they appear. Those who read the stile and directions of the form of process, will plainly see that such a case as that now before you, was never contemplated by the compilers of it. It is difficult to say whether they are to be considered as private Christians offended and accusing, or the occasion of the accusation, or as a church court taking the affair under their cognizance for judgment. They seem to have considered themselves as both. This I can never yield to; but they shall be at liberty to be either of them they think proper. And so I shall consider them first in the one light, and then in the other.

1st. If they be considered as Christians offended, and the accusers or occasion of the accusation, the rule is to be found in the 4th part of the 7th chapter of the form of process, "All Christians," &c. Here then, sir, I com-

plain of them, that they have not done as Chriſtians, not even what they reſolved to do as a court, and very much out of time. Have they been wary in accuſing me? Have they abſtained from publiſhing or ſpreading the ſcandal? Have they theſe three years by-paſt, converſed with me on the ſubject? Have they not in the controverſy every where called it a heinous crime; though they knew that was far from being generally yielded, and would not probably be yielded by me? Nay, now inſtead of privately converſing with me, during the ſeven weeks delay of the affair, without aſſigning a reaſon, have they not recorded it in their regiſter? Have they not made it a part of a proceſs, diſqualifying me for a call? I leave any one to judge whether this was following the rule laid down in the form of proceſs. Beſides, they act not only as private perſons, but judges; or at leaſt are making the enquiry themſelves, that they may know whether they may deſire the Preſbytery of Irvine to do it after them.

2d. Let us conſider them as a church court, taking the affair under their cognizance for judgment. Here to be ſure, there is a monſtrous impropriety. For, ſuppoſing them to have taken ever ſo juſt ſteps in other reſpects, I was never before them, I cannot be before them, I am not ſubject to them. Yet, ſir, as it cannot be before the Synod in any other way than they have been pleaſed to take it up in; let us ſee how agreeable it is to the form of proceſs, and whether they are ready to deal with me for a confeſſion. The form of proceſs mentions three ways of taking up a ſcandal againſt a miniſter. The two firſt none pretends to hold in this caſe. The laſt is, part 3, laſt clauſe, "that the *fama clamosa*," &c. Now, can any man ſay that this condition holds in the preſent caſe. Is this ſo ſcandalous in the eyes of the people, that a Preſbytery would be reproached if they let it paſs. If there be any ſuch *fama*, it is very ſilent; for I never heard of any fault found with the Preſbytery of Irvine, to whom it naturally fell to do it. On the contrary, I do affirm, becauſe I am able to prove, that the Preſbytery of Paiſley's taking it up, with very many, brings reproach upon them. Again, do they follow the rule preſcribed

even when that condition exists? Have they enquired into the rise, occasion, branches and grounds of this *fama clamosa*. This they were the more bound to do, that it is far from being an uncontradicted *fama;* so far from it, that the very prevailing *fama* is not that I am the author, but some how concerned in it. They themselves express it some such way in their minutes. This makes all the arguments about their passing over the relevancy, every way strong; because a man might have some accession to the publishing of a book in which some very bad things were; and without examination or specifying what this accession was, it would be very hard to judge him guilty of the worst. or of the whole. To say the truth, some of their well-wishers have made it a very dishonorable *fama* for me; saying that I helped to contrive the mischief, to collect the calumnies, but had not skill enough to give it its dress and form. Should not they have enquired then into the grounds of this *fama?* and have they ever done it?

Further, in the 5th paragraph of that chapter of the form of process, it is expressly appointed, that even after a process is begun upon a *fama clamosa*, the court must give a liberal and competent time to answer it. And the accused person is to be heard upon the relevancy. This is, sir, upon the relevancy in the way the facts are laid, even concerning a thing confessedly scandalous; and all this, before the court are to endeavor to bring him to a confession. From this, then, it is clear and evident, that however lawful or prudent it might be for private persons to commune with a man himself, till this be done there is no warrant from the form of process for a court to appoint any examination and enquiry; on the contrary, it is making, instead of mending a scandal. And if this is the rule in cases confessedly of a scandalous nature, it holds much more strongly in what is now before you.

The truth is, this is not only the order of proceeding expressly laid down with regard to ministers, but it is common equity, and in substance the same with the case of scandal in all other cases, and with respect to all other persons. For though when a particular accuser against a man appears, laying to his charge a gross crime, such as

uncleanneſs, it ſeems to be due to his own character, as well as to the public, that he ſhould profeſs innocence; yet it often happens that when the accuſation appears wanton and malicious, he puts the accuſer upon the proof, and refuſes to give any other ſatisfaction. And whenever any perſon does ſo, though the court may think it obſtinacy and ſtatelineſs, or that they cannot fully approve his conduct, yet they never condemn him on that account, but diſmiſs the proceſs for want of ſufficient light. And I have ſeen ſeveral caſes of this ſort, in which the court abſolutely refuſed to put a man to his oath, or even aſk him if he was willing to ſwear, unleſs there were ſome more preſumption than the bare accuſation. And indeed this is required in the form of proceſs. This, however, is ſtating the caſe too ſtrongly. But if there be no particular accuſer, but a vague and general *fama*, would it be tolerable for a court to call any gentleman whom they ſhall be pleaſed to ſuſpect, and put him upon an enquiry, whether he was ever guilty of the ſin of uncleanneſs? I dare ſay ſuch a meaſure would be deteſted by every reaſonable man.

But you will ſay, here is a *corpus debiti*. Then let me ſuppoſe a caſe exactly parallel—that a child were expoſed in a gentleman's neighborhood, no mother appearing or accuſing, but an ible rumour ariſes, that perhaps it may be his, or it may have been ſomebody about his houſe, and he acceſſary to the commiſſion of the crime; would it in that caſe be reaſonable and juſt, would it be according to the form of proceſs, to call him, and interrogate him, whether he had ever, or for twelve months preceding, been guilty of the crime of uncleanneſs—without making any previous enquiry, as to the riſe of the affair, or probability of the imputation? So, in this caſe, here is a child of the brain, expoſed to the world: the mother, that is to ſay, the preſs or the publiſher, accuſes nobody; nay, pretends that it is lawfully begotten. A vague rumor lays it to me. This hath never been enquired into, though the firſt broacher of it might eaſily be found; and yet I muſt be interrogated by a court, to

whom I am not ſubject, with whom as yet, as a court, I have nothing to do. In ſhort, ſir, what I would do if I were ſo irregularly attacked, and charged with a crime highly and confeſſedly ſcandalous, I do not know, and hope I ſhall never have occaſion to deliberate upon it. But in this vague and illegal accuſation of a doubtful crime, and a crime perhaps chiefly or only in the eyes of thoſe who accuſe me and their adherents, I hope I will be approved by every impartial perſon in ſtanding up for the rights of mankind, and refuſing to anſwer *super enquirendis*.

I could here put the Synod in mind of a queſtion of this nature, which came before the church of Scotland, in profeſſor S——'s proceſs. He refuſed to anſwer ſome queries put to him by the Preſbytery of Glaſgow, although they aroſe from, and were founded upon, ſome writings given in by himſelf. This was debated before the Aſſembly, and rejected by them, as they would give no encouragement to inquiſitorial proceedings.

But, ſir, nothing can demonſtrate more clearly the iniquity of ſuch practices, than what happened not long ago in this very Preſbytery, which is but little known, but which I am able to bring to light. And after I have narrated it, I leave it to the judgment of the Synod, whether they will countenance with their authority any ſimilar practice in another caſe. When Mr. C—— was preſented to the abbey church of Paiſley, there were ſome rumors raiſed, I know not how, as if he had been guilty of ſome practices tending to diſaffection. Theſe, I may ſafely ſay, were not diſcouraged by the Preſbytery, but mentioned again and again in their minutes; and though the candidate inſiſted much upon a regular judgment upon the relevancy, and an enquiry, they ſtill ſhifted both, and inſtead thereof appointed a conference with him. And what think you were the queſtions they put to him to remove the ſcandal?—Where did you learn your Engliſh? And what miniſter of the eſtabliſhed church did you hear? Where did you learn your Latin? and in whoſe houſe did you ſtay? Did you ever go near the epiſcopal meeting-houſe all the time you were at the

profeſſion of divinity? Did Mr. H—— or Mr. R—, epiſcopal miniſters, recommend you to C——'s family? Did your father attend ordinances in the pariſh church, where he lived? Have you any near relations that are related to the miniſters of this church? We aſk this, ſay they, that we may know the diſpoſitions of your friends.—What could be the intention of theſe queſtions? what could be the effect of their being anſwered, one way or the other? Might not the moſt loyal man in Britain, be brought under an odium in this manner. I flatter myſelf I am of as untainted, unſuſpected loyalty, as any man in the Preſbytery of Paiſley; and yet I could not affirm that I had never lodged in a diſaffected perſon's houſe, nor had the friendſhip of any ſuch; nor that I never came near the epiſcopal meeting-houſe all the time I was at the profeſſion of divinity. And did not theſe gentlemen know that ſuch things were perfectly frivolous and irrelevant? Yes, ſir, they knew it well; but ſtill they ſerved their purpoſe of diſobliging that people, and infuſing jealouſies. And ſo they myſteriouſly expreſs themſelves in their anſwer to the reaſons of appeal, that there are ſuch unhappy circumſtances in the preſenter's character, as do not recommend him to the choice of this people. I will not ſay, ſir, that all I have above repreſented is now to be found in their regiſter; for they have a ſalutary art of expunging from their minutes any thing that is diſhonorable to themſelves: but this I will ſay, it actually happened, and a great deal more. And I dare ſay, if there be any epiſcopalian here preſent, he will inſtantly add to his litany, From ſuch Spaniſh preſbyterians, good Lord deliver us.

Thus, ſir, I hope I have made it appear, that the Preſbytery of Paiſley have been guilty of moſt irregular procedure, and flagrant injuſtice to me, in paſſing a ſentence upon my character, where they had no title to judge me; in finding a relevancy without examination of the ſubject, and when I could not be heard in my defence; and laſtly, in appointing an inquiſition for diſcovering the fact, directly in the face of law and equity.

I am ſorry I have detained the Synod ſo long, Sir, but could not poſſibly ſpeak to this involved, perplexed accu-

ſation in ſhorter time; and I hope the importance of the cauſe to me, will plead for ſome indulgence, and procure your attention for a very few minutes longer, and then I have done. Let me, Sir, ſpeak plainly out; whatever may be pretended about the intereſt of religion being concerned in the fate of this pamphlet, there is ſtrong reaſon to ſuſpect that it is the credit of a party that is really at ſtake. We all know that there are very great differences of ſentiment among us, as to the government of the church; and it ſeems to be my misfortune, to be of oppoſite principles from ſeveral members of this preſbytery, on that point. This is the cauſe of my being charged with ill-nature and unpeaceableneſs. They themſelves, Sir, will not pretend to give any other inſtance of this temper; and I confeſs that as I reckon the Glory of God, and the edification of his church to be deeply concerned in the cauſe, I am reſolved in his ſtrength, to maintain and ſupport it to the utmoſt of my power, ſo long as I draw breath; and if I have been a firebrand, as I have been ſometimes called, I wiſh I could anſwer the title, and burn their pernicious ſchemes even to aſhes. And, Sir, as in no other caſe have I ever diſcovered any keenneſs of temper, ſo I truſt, that even in this, I have neither diſcovered an overbearing pride, or perverſeneſs of temper, but have ſupported what I eſteemed to be truth, with reſolution, but without violence. I cannot pretend to the polite and courtly ſtyle, in the ſame degree with ſome of my oppoſers; yet have I endeavored to preſerve the meekneſs of a Chriſtian, believing that the wrath of man worketh not the righteouſneſs of God.—Now, Sir, I beg every wiſe and honeſt man of the other ſide of the queſtion in our public differences, to determine ſeriouſly, whether he will approve of a preſbytery's making perſonal oppoſition, and becauſe a man is not in every reſpect of their way of thinking, barring his ſettlement to the utmoſt of their power; and whether it be decent, or truly moderate, not only to rebuke, ſuſpend and deprive thoſe who cannot go with them; but as the very laſt effort of tyranny, to attempt to caſt out any who are but ſuſpected of debating the point in writing.

Farther, I beg every man in this houſe, to lay his hand upon his heart, and ſay this day, in his judgment, whether he will, in order to reach a man of a different party from himſelf, approve of going contrary to all form and law, and eſtabliſhing a precedent of inquiſition. However ſecure ſome may think themſelves and their party at preſent, there is ſuch an inſtability in all human things, that the engines which they prepare againſt others, may be directed againſt themſelves. I know a fear of this kind for the moſt part operates but weakly upon men's minds; becauſe the caſes that may afterwards caſt up, cannot be clearly diſcerned, being hidden in the darkneſs of futurity; but, Sir, he is the wiſeſt man, that acts with moſt prudence, and does not expoſe himſelf or his friends to the law of retaliation. This I ſpeak in perfect ſecurity, as to myſelf, for if the church ſhall find that interrogation is a proper way of enquiring into facts, it will but open to me a larger field of information; and though it come to the real merits of this cauſe, the trial of the relevancy of this crime objected to me will take up at leaſt ſeven years in proceſſes of various kinds.

To conclude, Sir, though I will never approve of, or give my conſent for eſtabliſhing a practice which I think unjuſt and tyrannical; yet as to my own caſe, I will even ſubmit to be interrogated by this very party upon this juſt, this ſelf-evidently juſt condition, that the miniſters of that Preſbytery do ſubmit themſelves to be interrogated by me in turn, on their doctrine—their diligence in paſtoral duty—their care and government of their families—and their perſonal truth. If they will yield to this, I will anſwer upon oath, either inſtantly, or upon a month's preparation, not only as to this point, but all that they ſhall think fit to aſk, as to my character, that can accuſe me, from my birth this day. And if this condition be refuſed, the equity of their conduct I leave to the judgment of this venerable Synod.

AN

HUMBLE SUPPLICATION

To such of the Nobility and Gentry of Scotland as are Elders of the Church, and members of the General Assembly.

MUCH HONORED,

YOU will surely be ſenſible that it muſt have been a very urgent neceſſity that has compelled a man of my ſtation and profeſſion to become an author; eſpecially when I addreſs myſelf to you, whoſe circumſtances ſet you at ſo great a diſtance from me, and may, without that candor and condeſcenſion on your part, provoke you to contemn that advice which is offered voluntarily, and from ſuch a hand. And indeed there is nothing of which I am more firmly perſuaded, than that the affairs of the church of Scotland are drawing faſt towards a criſis, and that a little time will determine whether ſhe will ſink or ſwim. This view of things cannot fail to conſtrain every one who hath any regard to her proſperity and welfare, of which number I hope I ſhall always be, ſo long as I draw breath, to exert himſelf to the utmoſt for her ſupport; and alſo to ſpread the alarm, and call on others to aſſiſt, who have more ability and opportunity to be uſeful.

On this occaſion, I am emboldened to addreſs myſelf to you, not only as by your quality and ſtation, you are able

to contribute much to a change of the meaſures that have lately prevailed, but as your office of elders in the church, may be preſumed to incline you to be ready and active, for her proſperity and ſupport. I intended once to have ſtyled you brethren, becauſe I alſo am an elder, but was afraid of giving offence by too forward and aſſuming an introduction; however, I ſtill hope for ſome regard in conſequence of this relation, becauſe I have ever obſerved that a likeneſs of character, a participation of the ſame office, or indeed a likeneſs in almoſt any conſiderable circumſtance, creates a kind of connexion, and produces a ſympathy or fellow-feeling between the very higheſt and loweſt that fall under the ſame denomination. The inhabitants of the ſame city, though very different in their ſtations, reckon themſelves intereſted in one another. Thoſe of the ſame corporation are ſtill more cloſely connected. And there is a certain ſociety comprehending perſons of very diſtant characters in other reſpects, who are ſaid to have an extraordinary tenderneſs for each other's concerns. The ſociety I mean is that of free-maſons; for I am told a free-maſon, though a king, will ſhow a very great affection for a brother, although a beggar, or at leaſt the next thing to it, if there be no real beggars in that community.

It is not without a very important deſign that I have mentioned this; for I have obſerved ſome of late have endeavored to ſtate a diſtinction, or perhaps I may call it, to ſow ſedition, between the great elders of our church and the ſmaller. Many who are not wanting in an humble, if not ſervile reſpect to the elders that ſurround the commiſſioner's throne in the aſſembly-houſe, make it their buſineſs to throw all the blame of the confuſion that attends the ſettlement of any pariſh, upon the elders of lower rank, whom I may call (in alluſion to the ſimilitude of free-maſons) the operative members of the ſame ſociety. It is time, therefore, for us to ſpeak for ourſelves, and particularly to thoſe from whom, becauſe of our relation to them, of which I again boaſt, we may confidently expect a fair and impartial hearing.

One other ground of encouragement I have in my preſent repreſentation, viz. that many or moſt of our honorable

elders are bred to the law. Now, I find in the hiſtory of the goſpel, that it was a lawyer that took care of the body of our bleſſed Saviour, after it was crucified at the inſtigation of the prieſts. This is a paſſage recorded by all the four evangeliſts; and I hope one effect of its having a place in the bible, will be the ſtirring up ſuch of our lawyers as have a ſhare in the management of public affairs, to reſcue the church, which is Chriſt's myſtical body, from the tyrannical impoſitions of churchmen in power.

I have been conſidering with myſelf, whether I ought not to endeavor to raiſe my ſtyle a little, when ſpeaking to your honors, above what was either neceſſary or proper when ſpeaking to thoſe of a lower rank and weeker capacity. But upon mature deliberation, I am reſolved to continue in my old plain way, becauſe it is probable I ſhall acquit myſelf better in that than in any other. I have often obſerved, that when a countryman is called, upon buſineſs, to ſpeak to thoſe of high rank, if he behaves in a quiet way, makes as few motions as poſſible, and ſpeaks with ſimplicity, he paſſes very well; but if he begins to ſcrape with his right foot, and to imitate the manners of his betters, he expoſes himſelf to their deriſion. Should it happen that ſuch a man, upon his going out, hears a great loud laugh in the company he hath left, it is my opinion he ought to conclude they are making a jeſt of his ridiculous behavior; and if he were permitted to return back, it is probable he would find one or two in the middle of the room mimicking his geſtures for the entertainment of the reſt: for there is not a more refined pleaſure to thoſe in high life (eſpecially the ladies) than aping and deriding the manners of their inferiors. Nay, the ſame diſpoſition is to be found in all ranks towards ſuch as are below them. Even we tradeſmen and merchants have learned to ſpeak with contempt of a low-lived fellow, by which we mean one in lower life than our own. This hath determined me (as I ſaid) to aim at nothing but plainneſs of ſpeaking. And it is very poſſible it may happen in this, as in my former treatiſe, that to ſome I ſhall be found more plain than pleaſant.

The firſt point I am to apply to you upon, to which I humbly intreat your ſerious attention, is the manner of making ſettlements of miniſters in the ſeveral pariſhes throughout this church. It is not unknown to you, that this thing hath cauſed a great deal of confuſion in ſeveral corners of the country; that a great part of the people have, on that very account, ſeparated from the eſtabliſhed church; and many more have fallen into an indifference about religion, and given over attendance upon public inſtruction altogether. Now there are ſome things upon this ſubject that I muſt needs take for granted; becauſe I cannot find any thing more evidently true than they are in themſelves by which I might prove them; ſuch as that the inſtruction of a nation in religion is a matter of very great importance, and that you all believe it to be ſo; that there is no ground to hope that people will receive benefit by the inſtructions of thoſe whom they hate and abhor, and that it is impoſſible they can receive benefit from thoſe inſtructions which they will not hear. There is one thing more, which to me appears as evident as any of them, that no compulſion ought to be uſed to conſtrain men's choice in matters of religion. From theſe I think it plainly follows, that violent ſettlements, that is to ſay, giving a man a ſtipend, with a charge to inſtruct and govern the people within a certain diſtrict, the whole of which people do abſolutely refuſe to ſubject themſelves to his miniſtry, are, to ſay the leaſt, abſolutely unprofitable, and the money that is beſtowed upon the perſon ſo ſettled, is wholly thrown away.

There are not a few in whoſe hearing if I ſhould expreſs myſelf as above, they would immediately reply, All this is very true, and we are ſorry for it; but as the law now ſtands with regard to patronages, how can it be helped? Now, though I am far from being of theſe gentlemen's opinions, that this matter might not be made much better, even as the law now ſtands, if the church were ſo diſpoſed as I hope ſhortly to ſhow, yet I will ſuppoſe it for a little, and make a few reflections upon the conduct of many in that ſuppoſed ſituation.

And firſt, they muſt forgive me if I ſay that I can by no means believe the hardſhip of the law of patronage lies very heavy upon their ſpirits, or at leaſt if it does they ſupport

themſelves under it with ſurpriſing firmneſs, and diſcover not the leaſt outward ſign of uneaſineſs. Are they ever heard to complain of it, unleſs in a conſtrained manner, when others mention it before them? Do they not ſhew all willingneſs to appoint ſuch ſettlements—to enforce them, to defend them? Do they in the leaſt diſcountenance ſuch probationers as accept of preſentures unconditionally, although it cannot be pretended that the law obliges any man to this? On the contrary, are not theſe the men whom they love and delight in, whoſe characters they celebrate for knowledge and underſtanding, and for diſintereſted virtue?

I do confeſs then I am apt to doubt the ſincerity of thoſe gentlemen, when they profeſs their ſorrow for the hardſhips they are under by the patronage act; becauſe ſome apparent tokens of their concern might have been expected, and are no where to be ſeen. But alas! why am I expreſſing my ſuſpicions what is our ſituation? things are changing ſo faſt, that it is impoſſible to write even ſuch a book as this with propriety, and ſuited to the times; for even ſince I wrote the above paragraph I have received information from Edinburgh, which if it had come before it was written, would have prevented the writing of it; and even, if not for mangling my own book, I would yet expunge it. I am aſſured that laſt May it was openly profeſſed by ſome in the aſſembly, that preſentures were of all others, the beſt way of ſettling preachers; and that it was the *proto pseudon* of men of my principles to imagine otherwiſe. This *proto pseudon* is a phraſe which I do not underſtand, and therefore muſt let it alone. It may be a phraſe of ſome of the learned languages, and it may be of no language at all. However I have recorded it with great fidelity, as I am informed the gentleman pronounced it. And whatever is its particular ſignification, I ſuppoſe its general meaning is, that patronages are no grievance, but a bleſſing. As therefore, it is probable that your lordſhips and honors have this many times affirmed to you, it is neceſſary that I ſhould firſt attempt to prove what I thought had been ſelf-evident, that we are in a bad ſituation, before I crave your aſſiſtance for our relief.

SPEECH

IN THE

GENERAL ASSEMBLY,

On the Transportation of Dr. C———.

MODERATOR,

AS it is uſual for people to differ almoſt upon every ſubject, I am not ſurpriſed that there ſhould be ſome in this Aſſembly, who are for appointing, that this tranſportation ſhall take place; but I apprehend it is really ground of ſurpriſe, to ſee the way in which they urge their opinion; they do not ſpeak as if they were weighing and deliberating upon the cauſe, that they might be able to give a juſt determination; they do not ſpeak as if clearly ſatisfied themſelves; or as if they deſired to convince others, and bring them over to their own opinion; but they ſpeak in an overbearing manner, and preſs the concluſion with a viſible diſpleaſure at the time ſpent upon it, and impatience that any body ſhould differ from, or contradict them. But as poſitiveneſs is ſeldom any ſtrong preſumption of a good cauſe, ſo I think it is very much miſplaced here; and as the quiet and comfort of a large pariſh immediately, and the whole country ſide more remotely, depends upon our deciſion, I hope the aſſembly

will not give it, till after mature deliberation and with real impartiality.

The firſt thing, no doubt, to be conſidered, is, whether the commiſſion have exceeded their powers, that we may ſee whether we have room at all for the other queſtion, about the expediency of this tranſportation; and after reading the words of the aſſembly's remit, I cannot help being of opinion, with the great majority of the members of Preſbytery, that the commiſſion had no power to determine this cauſe. Is it not plain that this is not the cauſe which was before the laſt aſſembly? And is it not confeſſed on all hands, that the commiſſion had no title to take in any cauſes, but ſuch as were remitted to them? Is it not plain, that the words in any after queſtion relating to this ſettlement, are not to be found in it? It is alſo proper to obſerve, from the almoſt conſtant uſe of theſe words in the remits of the aſſembly, that they do not ſuppoſe that a queſtion relating to the ſame ſettlement with another, makes it the ſame cauſe. The anſwer made to this is, that it was a miſtake or omiſſion in the clerk of the aſſembly. Admitting, Sir, that this had been the caſe, it would be extremely wrong and dangerous, to approve the commiſſion in paying no regard to that legal defect, but taking in the cauſe. For the aſſembly itſelf to make free with, and deſpiſe eſtabliſhed forms of procedure, is of the very worſt conſequence. I have heard ſome honorable members, eminently ſkilled in the law, affirm, that for a court to deſpiſe even its own forms, is to make way for the admiſſion of many inſtances of great and real injuſtice. But for the commiſſion, which is a delegated court, ſo far to come over form, as to take in a cauſe not remitted to them, is a bold tranſgreſſion with a witneſs: and if allowed, muſt be attended with conſequences, which it is impoſſible to foreſee, but can ſcarce be imagined worſe, than they really will be an effect

But Sir, why ſhould any ſay this was either an omiſſion in the clerks, or an overſight in the laſt aſſembly. I am ſure for my part, I think they would have done wrong had they done it in any other way. What is the reaſon of this clauſe, (or any after queſtion) when it is inſerted.

It is after the part of the cauſe is decided, to prevent contentious people to protract a ſettlement, by fooliſh and frivolous appeals upon every little interloquitur or reſolution of a preſbytery, in carrying it into execution. But in this caſe, neither all the parties, nor the principal part of the cauſe itſelf, was before the aſſembly at all; and I dare ſay, we may all remember to have heard it given as the opinion of the moſt judicious members of this church, that it is a very wrong meaſure to refer any cauſe of moment to the commiſſion, that hath not been in a good meaſure heard and underſtood by the aſſembly itſelf. Moderator, I beg leave further to ſay, that I hope this aſſembly will not authoriſe the commiſſion in making a long arm, to take in cauſes without ſufficient powers, becauſe the commiſſion is certainly the moſt unhappily conſtituted court of any in this church. I ſay this without intending, and I hope without giving offence to any body; for ſuppoſing human nature in us to be juſt what it is in other people, the members of the commiſſion being ſo numerous, and ſpread over all Scotland, few of them attend voluntarily, and it is the eaſieſt thing in the world for intereſted perſons to bring up a number of a particular way of thinking, and they may carry any cauſe whatever.

Thus, Sir, it appears that the ſentence of the commiſſion has plainly exceeded their powers in ſome meaſure, even by the confeſſion of the friends of this tranſportation. Let us conſider it a little in itſelf, and ſee if it is like to be ſo great a benefit, or ſo great an honor to this church, as that we ſhould either forgive the commiſſion the encroachment they have been guilty of, or ſhould now do ourſelves, what they have formerly done in a precipitate and irregular manner. Upon this branch of the ſubject, I am very much at a loſs, not what to ſay, if every thing were to be brought out that might be urged againſt it, but to bring the argument within ſome compaſs, and chiefly indeed to diſcover ſome hope of ſucceſs by reaſoning from ſome common principles, on which we ſhall generally agree.

Moderator, I take this opportunity of declaring before this aſſembly, that I have always had the deepeſt ſenſe of

the diſhonor and loſs of authority which this church has ſuffered, and what indeed is infinitely more, the injury which the ſouls of men have ſuffered, by many ſettlements in which we have ordained a paſtor without a people; at the ſame time, I am ſenſible that many worthy men and faithful miniſters, look upon themſelves as under a neceſſity in ſome ſuch caſes from the law of patronage; and I am afraid many from a habit of doing this where there is neceſſity, are unwilling to come out of the ſame tract, and continue to do it, when there is no neceſſity at all.

Moderator, I deſire it may be obſerved that I do not believe, and I know nobody ſo fooliſh as to believe, what is commonly imputed to us, that any Chriſtian as ſuch, has a right to call a miniſter on an eſtabliſhment; we know that nobody has any right to call a miniſter on an eſtabliſhment, excepting thoſe to whom the law gives it; neither would I contend that every man ought to have a right, though we had it in our power, to make laws upon that ſubject, ſince this ſeeming equality would be a vile inequality. But, Sir, I would chooſe to form my judgment upon a few principles, in which I ſhould think, hardly any in this aſſembly would diſagree. Has not every man a natural right, well ſecured to him in this happy iſland, to judge for himſelf in matters of religion, and in fact to adhere to any miniſter he pleaſes? Is not the legal ſtipend intended to provide a ſufficient and uſeful paſtor to the people within the bounds of a certain pariſh? can he be of much ſervice to them, if he be upon ill terms with them? or can he do them any at all, if they will not hear him? Does any body deſire to compel them by penal or eccleſiaſtical laws to hear him: or would ſuch forced religion be of any worth? Is not then the legal encouragement unhappily loſt and miſapplied by ſomebody's fault, when a miniſter is ſettled to whom nobody will adhere? Now, Sir, the inference that I would draw from theſe principles is no more than this, that decency and our indiſpenſable duty as a church court, requires us to make no ſuch ſettlements but with regret, and never without a real neceſſity; and the cauſe we have now before us, is one in

which no ſuch neceſſity exiſts. It is a tranſportation, Sir, the expediency of which we are to judge of and the perſon concerned is not only bound in duty, but can be eaſily compelled by law, to ſubmit to our deciſion. The great argument that always has been uſed againſt this or the like reaſoning, has been brought out in this cauſe, that the people were unreaſonable and prejudiced, and have been ſtirred up by evil-minded perſons. This argument, Sir, is ſo old and ſtale, that I am ſurpriſed people are not aſhamed of it, and that the ingenuity of the lawyers has not been able to invent another, that ſhall have the advantage of being new. How often have we heard from this bar, this pariſh would have been agreeably and peaceably ſettled, but very early a combination was formed—This is all in all, the reſt follows of courſe. I am perſuaded, Sir, from the certain knowledge of many particular inſtances, in which this was alleged, that in nine caſes of ten the allegation is falſe. One perſon in a pariſh or country ſide may be active, and it may be ſaid with plauſibility, that he is the main ſpring of the oppoſition. Sir, it is very eaſy to lead a people according to their own inclinations; but it is not ſo eaſy as many ſeem to ſuppoſe, to change their inclinations and direct their choice. In the mean time, it is always forgotten that the argument is founded not upon the cauſe or occaſion, but upon the reality of the averſion of the people to the miniſter.

Moderator, an argument that is made uſe of to perſuade us to order this tranſportation, is, that if it ſhould be refuſed, it would encourage the people to reſiſt in other caſes. I am afraid, Sir, that the tame ſubmiſſion which indeed is faſt approaching, and which many ſeem ſo ardently to deſire, can never take place, till there is a total indifference about religion among all the members of the eſtabliſhed church; take our neighbor country of England, as an example of that deſirable peace. But if this argument be laid as it ought to be, that people ſhould not be headſtrong and unreaſonable, it operates plainly the contrary way; for there is nothing whatever that would give us ſo much weight and influence with the people, as that we ſhow a proper tenderneſs to them, as we have opportunity. If

we do not oppreſs them, when we have it in our power to relieve them, we may expect to have ſome influence over them, when we are ſtraitened and diſtreſt ourſelves.

Beſides, Sir, on this ſubject of the prejudices of the people, this pretence is carried a moſt unreaſonable and extravagant length, and nothing but the prejudice in themſelves, could make men ſpeak in ſuch a ſtile. Many will needs have it to be prejudice and groundleſs prejudice in a people, if they do not fall in with a man to be their miniſter, againſt whoſe life and doctrine they cannot bring any legal objection. Alas, Sir, all ſuch things are matters of election and choice, and not of legal proof. In illuſtration of the people's caſe, there is a very good example given, that a man would have juſt cauſe of complaint if you ſhould force a phyſician upon him of whoſe ſkill he had no opinion, though he could not prove him inſufficient before the faculty.

But, Sir, as it would be wrong to attribute oppoſition to a miniſter's ſettlement in all caſes to groundleſs prejudice, I am ſorry to ſay it, but I am obliged in juſtice to ſay it, we have very little reaſon to do ſo in the preſent caſe. Even in the caſe of a probationer, when he abſolutely adheres to a preſentation, notwithſtanding the greateſt oppoſition from the people, it is but a ſorry mark of love to ſouls, and of that ſelf-denial which every Chriſtian ſhould continually maintain. Many things however may be ſaid in favor of a probationer; yet, Sir, for a ſettled miniſter not only to act this part, but to excel all that ever were before him in a bold and inſolent contempt of the people, as plainly appears to be Dr. C———'s caſe, is ſuch a conduct, that I ſhall have a worſe opinion of this aſſembly than I have at preſent, if they do not openly expreſs their indignation at ſuch indecency of behaviour. In the hiſtory of the church we find no character more odious, or more unclerical, if I may ſpeak ſo, than ambition and open ſolicitation of eccleſiaſtical preferment. Little changes in forms, Sir, do often produce at leaſt great changes in manners and characters. In former times in our church, the probationer or miniſter himſelf, was never conſidered as a party, but was conſidered as the ſubject concerning which

that proceſs was carried on by the callers or referrees; but now they have been for ſome time paſt, conſidered as parties—they begin to allow the cauſe to appear at the bar—to urge their claim—to conſider the people who are to be their charge as their adverſaries, and to treat them with contempt and diſdain.

I confeſs, Sir, I am not able to imagine what are the views of a miniſter who acts in this manner. It is not I fear eaſy to anſwer, that he reſolves to change his ſituation and take upon him that office, from ſincere regard to the glory of God and love to ſouls, which he muſt profeſs at his admiſſion. But as we muſt be tender and cautious in judging of the inward motives of others, I ſhall leave that to him who judgeth the ſecrets of all hearts; but in the mean time, every one in this houſe is now called to judge whether it would be for the glory of God, and the good of mankind, to ſuffer him to execute his intention. Let it be conſidered with ſerioufneſs. Moderator, it is not only the people of the pariſh, or thoſe of lower rank, but many of all ſtations whom we ſhall offend, in the proper ſenſe of the word, if we order this ſettlement. They are led by ſuch things to treat, and they often do treat with deriſion, a miniſter's concern for his uſefulneſs, and affirm that it is no more than a deſire of a comfortable benefice and ſalary for life. I ſhall be ſorry to ſee the day, when by reſembling them in their practice, we ſhall learn from England to leave the people and the work altogether out of the act, and ſo call our charges no more *parishes*, but *livings*.

LETTER

SENT TO

SCOTLAND,

FOR THE

SCOTS MAGAZINE.

I AM informed by my correſpondents in Scotland, that ſeveral letters have been publiſhed in the newſpapers there, containing the moſt virulent reflections upon me, on account of an advertiſement by J— P——, merchant of Glaſgow, relating to the ſettlement of a tract of land in Nova Scotia, in which he mentions my being concerned. One or two of theſe papers have been ſent me, and contain ſo many miſtakes in point of fact, as well as betray ſuch ignorance of the ſubject they attempt to treat, that it would be a diſgrace for any man to enter into a formal quarrel with ſuch opponents. Were I in Scotland at this time, I ſhould think it a very great departure from prudence, to take the leaſt public notice of theſe invectives. Few perſons have been leſs concerned than I have been, through life, to contradict falſe accuſations, from an opinion which I formed early, and which has been confirmed by experience, that there is ſcarcely any thing more harmleſs than political or party malice. It is beſt

to leave it to itself; opposition and contradiction are the only means of giving it life and duration.

But as I am now at so great a distance, and the subject of the scandal is what passes in America, so that impartial persons in general, may be less able to judge of the probability of facts, and cannot have proper opportunities of making a complete enquiry, I think it necessary to state this matter with all the perspicuity and brevity of which I am capable. The accusation, I think, may be reduced to the following argument—Migrations from Britain to America, are not only hurtful, but tend to the ruin of that kingdom; therefore, J. W. by inviting people to leave Scotland, and settle in America, is an enemy to his country.

It will not be improper to mention in the entry, that my having any concern in such an extensive undertaking, was wholly accidental and unexpected. I was invited and pressed to it, from a motive that was not at all concealed, that it would give the people who intended to come out, greater confidence that they should meet with fair treatment. This very reason induced me to consent; and that I might the more effectually answer that purpose, one of the express conditions of my joining with the company was, that no land should be sold dearer to any coming from Scotland, than I should direct. This was the more necessary, that either through mistake, and the power of European ideas, or through misguided avarice, some advertisements had been published in the Scots newspapers, which would not appear surprising to persons born and educated in Scotland, but which are infinitely ridiculous to one acquainted with American affairs. In particular, one I cut out of a Glasgow newspaper, and sent home, relating to Newfoundland, where persons were invited to go to make their fortunes, by renting each family thirty acres of land, at the easy rent of six-pence sterling at first, and gradually rising till it came to two shillings yearly for ever. Now how absurd is this, when in many places you can buy the fee simple of land for the same or less money than is here asked for rent? Besides, how shall thirty acres of land maintain any family, in a place where land is so cheap, and labor so dear?

I have heard it given as a reaſon for theſe enſnaring propoſals, that people in Britain will not believe that land is good for any thing, if you offer it for a few ſhillings per acre in fee ſimple. But the people in Britain ſhould be told, that the value of land does not depend upon its quality, unleſs in a very ſmall degree—It depends upon its ſituation, diſtance from other ſettlements, and many circumſtances that need not be mentioned. It is a matter now as fully aſcertained, as univerſal uncontradicted teſtimony can make it, that the back land in America, is in general better than that along the ſhore, though very different in value; becauſe the one is full of trees and wild beaſts, and the other is full of houſes, fields and orchards. One would think that this matter might be well enough underſtood by this time. When a new ſettlement is making, eſpecially if one family or one company have a very large tract, they will ſell it very cheap; and if they are urgent to forward the ſettlement, they will give it to one or two families at firſt for nothing at all; and their profit does not ariſe from the price paid by the firſt purchaſers, but from the proſpect of ſpeedily raiſing the value of what remains. Any man that can think, may underſtand this from J—P——'s advertiſement. He propoſes to ſell to the firſt families, at ſix-pence ſterling an acre. What profit could he make of that ſmall price? Suppoſing he ſhould ſell 20,000 acres, the whole produce would be but five hundred pounds, to be divided among twelve or fourteen perſons. The plain fact is, that the ſum is not at all equivalent to the trouble and expence of ſerving out the patent; therefore the profit muſt be future, and muſt ariſe wholly from the proſperity of the ſettlement. I believe it is a rule without any exception, that a man's duty is his intereſt; but there is no caſe whatever, in which the intereſt of both parties is more manifeſtly the ſame, than in ſelling and purchaſing new lands to ſettle upon; for the proprietors can receive no benefit, but from the ſucceſs and thriving of the ſettlers.

New land may be bought in America at all prices, from ſix-pence ſterling an acre, to forty ſhillings; and thoſe who would judge of the quality by the price, would do

juſt like one who ſhould judge that an acre ſold for a houſe in the city, muſt be twenty times better in ſoil, than the fields at two miles diſtance, becauſe it is twenty times the price. The price of land in America, is riſing very faſt, and ſometimes riſes in particular places, far more rapidly than could be foreſeen. A gentleman who has a large tract in New-York government, within theſe three years, offered to give away for nothing, ſeveral thouſand acres, at the rate of two hundred acres to each family of actual ſettlers, and yet has given away none; but ſince that time has ſold a great deal at four ſhillings and ſix-pence ſterling, and now will ſcarce ſell any at that price.

Having premiſed the above, I would intreat the reader's attention to the following remarks:

1. There is very little ground for being alarmed at the migrations from Britain to America. The numbers who come abroad, never have been, and probably never will be, of any conſequence to the population of the country. Any one who will read Monteſquieu, will ſoon be ſatisfied that when the ſpirit and principles of a conſtitution are good, occaſional migrations, and even war, famine and peſtilence, are hardly felt after a little time. The place of thoſe who are removed is ſpeedily filled. Two or three hundred families going abroad, makes a great noiſe; but it is nothing at all to the people in Great-Britain, and will but make way for the ſettlement and proviſion of thoſe who ſtay behind, and occaſion them to marry and multiply the faſter. It is probable, that the people in Britain imagine that the new ſettlements in America, are wholly filled by thoſe who come from Europe—It is far otherwiſe. They do not make the fortieth part in any new ſettlement. Such tracts are peopled from the adjacent ſettlements at firſt, with a few ſtranger emigrants; but their chief increaſe is from natural generation. If a ſettlement is good, a few families will ſpeedily make a colony; but if otherwiſe, you may ſend in ſhips full of people every year, and yet it will come to nothing. If a few paſſengers coming out from Britain, threaten deſtruction to that populous country, what inſtant ruin muſt come upon the ſettled parts of New-England, New-York, New-Jerſey, and Penn-

ſylvania, from whence many times the number remove every year to the back countries, and yet it has not any ſenſible effect, either on the price of land or the number of the people, which continue to increaſe notwithſtanding. America is certainly exhibiting at this time, a ſcene that is new in the hiſtory of mankind. It increaſes in a proportion that no political calculations have yet been able to underſtand or lay down rules for. The reaſon of this I take to be, that when colonies were ſent out in ancient times, the people and the ſoil were ſomewhat ſimilar, and improved by ſlow degrees; but in America we ſee a wild, but a noble ſoil, taken poſſeſſion of by all the power, wealth, and learning of Europe, which puſhes on its improvement, with a rapidity which is inconceivable.

Another thing ought not to be omitted; there are great numbers of people that go from America to Britain, ſo that the migration is not all one way. The people in New England (an old ſettlement) ſay that they have ſent twice as many people to England, as ever came out of it to them. But though upon the whole, while this country is but yet ſettling, the number coming out ſhould be greater; yet there is this difference, that they commonly come out poor, and return rich. This is very much to the advantage of Britain, if wealth and an increaſed value of land be an advantage. The truth is even as to numbers, though I do not think ſo many people go from America to Europe, as come from Europe to America; yet I am apt to think, that there is little difference in the number that goes to, or comes from the iſland of Great Britain.

2. But ſuppoſing, (what I do not believe) that inviting people over from Scotland to America, did tend in ſome degree to depopulate that part of the world, I cannot ſee why a man who does ſo ſhould for that reaſon, be called an enemy to his country. What is it for a man to be a friend to his country? Is it to wiſh well to the ſtones and the earth, or the people that inhabit it? Can he be an enemy to them, by pointing out to ſuch of them as are poor or oppreſſed, where they may have a happy and plentiful proviſion, and their poſterity be multiplied as the ſand of the ſea? If he is their enemy by deceiving them, the diſ-

covery will soon be made, and the design will be detested; or rather indeed, the discovery would have been made long ago, as the intercourse between Great Britain and America has been of so many years standing. Is he then the enemy of those who stay behind? Not surely of the multitude, or common people, for there will be but more room made for them, and the more easy access to a comfortable subsistence. It remains then, that he must be the enemy of the landholders, who may run some risk of being obliged to lower their rents. But is this a liberal way of thinking, to say a man is an enemy to his country, while he promotes the happiness of the great body of the people, with a small diminution of the interest of an handful? Allowing therefore this argument all the force that it can pretend to, the accusation is base and scandalous, arising from a littleness of mind, incapable of cherishing a generous love of mankind. I cannot help thinking it is doing a real service to my country, when I shew that those of them who find it difficult to subsist on the soil in which they were born, may easily transport themselves to a soil and climate vastly superior to that. Sobriety and industry cannot fail to be attended by independance and abundance; neither is this a matter that can be doubted by those who reflect a little on the nature of things. A country where land is cheap, provisions in plenty, and as a natural consequence, labor is dear, must be favourable to the industrious husbandman. His chief concern ought to be, to guard against the temptations always attendant on such a state, viz. laziness and intemperance. I will take this opportunity also to observe, that such as have a small independant fortune in Britain, if they have a taste for agriculture, might easily in America, live upon their estates as well as those in Britain who have a yearly revenue equal to their whole stock. But this is only in case a man lives upon his land, and eats the fruit of it. If he expects that he may live idly and magnificently in a city, and rent out his land at a high price, he will find himself miserably mistaken. It would be a strange country indeed, if land might be bought cheap, and rented dear. This is impossible; for by what arguments could you persuade a man to

pay a high rent for land, when by going a little back, he may have the property to himſelf for a ſmall matter.

But after all, I can never admit that the happineſs of one claſs of men depends upon the miſery of another; or that it can be any way contrary to the intereſt of the landholders in Scotland, that a few who find themſelves pinched in their circumſtances, or who have an active and enterpriſing diſpoſition, ſhould remove to America. There are always ſtrong motives to hinder a man's removal from his own country, and it cannot be ſuppoſed that any conſiderable number will think of ſuch a meaſure, unleſs they are really in an oppreſſed ſtate. If this is the caſe, from the natural courſe of things, their removal will be no injury to any body; but like a ſwarm of bees coming off from a hive that is too full. If it is the caſe in particular places, from the iron hand of tyranny, I ſee no reaſon to offer any excuſe for the meritorious act of aſſiſting them to make their eſcape. Let not people confine themſelves to narrow, ſelfiſh views. No part of Europe has received, or does now receive a greater acceſſion of wealth, from the American ſettlements, than Great-Britain; and perhaps there is no part of Great-Britain where the rent of land has riſen higher by the ſame means, than Scotland. I ſuppoſe every gentleman in that part of the kingdom, is well pleaſed to hear that ſeveral thouſand Palatines, or people from the north of Ireland go to America every year—or that from time to time, ſome one or other, who went abroad with a lancet in his pocket, is coming back with an opulent eſtate, to ſettle in his neighbourhood—or that no wealthy American is ſatisfied, till he has ſent his ſon home, as they call it, to ſpend from two or three hundreds, to as many thouſands, in order to complete his education by ſtudy, or end his life by gambling. If ſo, why ſhould he grudge that ſome of his poorer countrymen ſhould acquire a comfortable ſettlement there, though with little proſpect of returning, eſpecially as it is impoſſible for them to do any thing for the improvement of America, that will not in the end redound to the advantage of Great-Britain.

3. I have only further to ſay, that the outcry made upon this ſubject, is as impolitic, as it is unjuſt. If I wanted

to people America from Scotland, I would not think of employing a more effectual way, than exciting or hiring one or two authors, who have nothing elſe to do, to write againſt it. This would neceſſarily make people pay attention to the ſubject, and ſeek after the information which they would otherwiſe have neglected. At the ſame time, as human nature in general, is not very fond of reſtraint, they would perhaps be the more diſpoſed to remove when they found their landlords anxious that they ſhould ſtay. I deſire it may be particularly obſerved, that I have not ſaid in any part of the above diſcourſe, or do I believe that there is any hard-heartedneſs or diſpoſition to oppreſs in the landlords of Scotland, more than in any other country, nor more at this time than any former period. The riſe of lands has been the conſequence of an increaſe of trade and wealth, and the diſpoſition to go abroad in the common people, at preſent, is owing to the ſame cauſe that made clerks and ſupercargoes go out, for theſe fifty years paſt, viz. the hope of bettering their circumſtances. It is both unjuſt and impoſſible to hinder them, if they be ſo minded; and for the reaſons given above, I am perſuaded it will not be the leaſt injury to thoſe of any rank whom they leave behind. For my own part, my intereſt in the matter is not great; but ſince Providence has ſent me to this part of the world, and ſince ſo much honor has been done me, as to ſuppoſe that my character might be ſome ſecurity againſt fraud and impoſition, I ſhall certainly look upon it as my duty, to do every real ſervice in my power, to ſuch of my countrymen as ſhall fall in my way, and ſhall either deſire or ſeem to need my aſſiſtance.

J. W.

IGNORANCE OF THE BRITISH

WITH RESPECT TO

AMERICA.

To the Editor of the Scots Magazine.

Philadelphia, May 28, 1771.

SIR,

I SAW in your magazine (Appendix 1770) a letter, ſigned E. R. containing ſome remarks upon, and a ſevere condemnation of Dr. Lathrop's ſermon at Boſton, entitled, "Innocent Blood crying for Vengeance." Theſe remarks are introduced with obſerving, that the ſynod of New-York and Philadelphia had written a letter, and claimed relation to the church of Scotland; and then ſays the author, 'on reading of which, I could not help 'thinking, if we may judge of the American church from 'the ſample here given, that our church derives no great 'honor from her weſtern progeny; but I hope the ſtock 'is better than the ſample.'

Now, ſir, as to this author's obſervations on Dr. Lathrop's ſermon, I ſhall ſay little; becauſe perhaps it cannot be wholly juſtified—yet, if all circumſtances are duly attended to, there is as little reaſon to inſult or glory over the people of Boſton, as there was to excite the public reſentment againſt captain P——. But what I have

only in view, is ſhortly to expoſe the exceſſive abſurdity and ignorance of bringing in the ſynod of New-York and Philadelphia on this occaſion. Were the author of this ſermon even a member of the ſynod, or any way connected with it, the attempt would be impertinent; becauſe no church can be ſuppoſed anſwerable for the prudence of every particular perſon connected with her, eſpecially the wiſdom or propriety of their publications. Does the church of Scotland deſire to be judged by this rule? I ſuppoſe not. Nor will I be guilty of ſo much injuſtice, as to judge of her by this her friend and advocate. 'I hope (as 'he ſays) the ſtock is better than the ſample.' For,

How aſtoniſhing muſt be the ignorance of that gentleman concerning the Britiſh dominions in America, when he ſuppoſes the miniſters of Boſton to be a part of the ſynod of New-York and Philadelphia! Did the ſynod's letter ſay any ſuch thing? Did it not enumerate the provinces in which their members reſide? Did it not inform the public, that it is but ſeventy years ſince the firſt preſbytery met in this country? But give me leave to inform your correſpondent, that it is about one hundred and forty years ſince the people of New-England eſtabliſhed a college at Cambridge near Boſton: that their churches are upon the independent plan, and are in the four New-England provinces above five hundred in number; whereas the whole ſynod of New-York and Philadelphia contained, when their letter was written, but one hundred and twenty-ſeven members, and does not now amount to one hundred and fifty.

I do not mean by this to diſclaim connexion with the churches of New England. They are a moſt reſpectable part of the church of Chriſt. Nor do I think that any part of the Britiſh empire is at this day, equal to them for real religion and ſound morals. My ſingle purpoſe is to teach your correſpondent, and your readers in general, not to write upon American affairs, unleſs they underſtand them. I tell you nothing but truth when I ſay, that being a Briton, I have often bluſhed in company, to hear ſtories narrated of the abſurd and ignorant manner in which perſons of no inconſiderable ſtations in Britain, have talk-

ed of things and places in America. We have heard of a gentleman in the houſe of commons, frequently making mention of the *island* of Pennſylvania; and of another who in the privy counſel inſiſted, after contradiction, on his being right in his deſcription of the *island* of New-Jerſey.

But what excels every thing is the following ſtory, which I have been aſſured by perſons well acquainted with it, was a fact. Some years ago, a frigate came from England with diſpatches for many, or moſt of the governors of provinces in North America. The captain had orders to go firſt to New-York, and from thence to proceed to Georgia, the Carolinas, Virginia, Maryland, Pennſylvania, and the Jerſeys. When he arrived at New-York, he delivered his diſpatches there, and mentioned his orders. The governor told him, if you will give me the letters for the governors of New-Jerſey and Pennſylvania, I will undertake to have them delivered in forty-eight hours; but if you take the rout preſcribed to you, perhaps they will not receive them in three months. To which the captain replied, I do not care a farthing about the matter; I will ſtick to my inſtructions.

I am, ſir, your moſt obedient,
humble ſervant,
X. Y.

REFLECTIONS

On the present State of PUBLIC AFFAIRS, *and on the Duty and Interest of America in this Important Crisis.*

THAT the preſent is an important æra to America, has been ſo often repeated, that I ſuppoſe no man doubts it, and I hope few will forget it. Yet, however auguſt the idea, it is capable of being greatly enlarged. It will be an important æra in the hiſtory of mankind. The extent of this country is ſuch, that as it is now, and probably will ſoon be ſettled, it makes no inconſiderable part of the globe itſelf. The European in general, but particularly the Britiſh ſettlements in America, have for theſe hundred years paſt, been exhibiting to the world a ſcene differing in many reſpects from what it ever beheld. In all the ancient emigrations, or colonial ſettlements, the number was ſmall, the territory very limited, and which was ſtill more, the people and the ſoil were almoſt alike uncultivated; and therefore both proceeded to improvement by very ſlow degrees. But in America we ſee a country almoſt without bounds, new and untouched, taken poſſeſſion of at once by the power, the learning, and the wealth of Europe.

Hence it is that the cultivation and the population of America have advanced with a rapidity next to miraculous, and of which no political calculators have principles or data ſufficient to make a certain judgment. I hold every thing that has been ſaid on the numbers in America to be good for nothing, except in certain places where they have proceeded on actual numeration. When writers

ſtate, that the inhabitants in America double themſelves in twenty or twenty-five years, they ſpeak by gueſs, and they ſay nothing. It may be under or over the truth in certain places; but there are others in which they become twenty times the number in ſeven years. I do not know, and therefore will not attempt to conjecture, how faſt mankind may multiply in a country that is in the moſt favorable ſtate poſſible, both in itſelf, and for receiving an acceſſion from others leſs happily circumſtanced. What is more certain, as well as of more importance to obſerve, is, that the Britiſh colonies in North-America, have in this reſpect exceeded every other country upon the face of the earth.

What has cauſed this difference? Does the climate of Britain naturally produce more wiſdom, ſtrength and activity, than that of France, Spain or Portugal? Surely not, or wo to America itſelf; for the beſt of its colonies are in the climate of theſe very countries. It is therefore without doubt owing to the liberty which pervades the Britiſh conſtitution, and came with the coloniſts to this part of the earth. Monteſquieu has, with inimitable beauty, ſhewn that the natural cauſes of population or depopulation, are not half ſo powerful as the moral cauſes; by which laſt he means the ſtate of ſociety, the form of government, and the manners of the people. War, famine and peſtilence are ſcarcely felt, where there is liberty and equal laws. The wound made by thoſe ſore judgments is ſpeedily cloſed by the vigor of the conſtitution; whereas, in a more ſickly frame, a trifling ſcratch will rankle and produce long diſeaſe, or perhaps terminate in death. We need go no further than our own country to have full proof of the force of liberty. The ſouthern colonies, bleſſed as they are with a ſuperior ſoil and more powerful ſun, are yet greatly inferior to Pennſylvania and New-England, in numbers, ſtrength, and value of land in proportion to its quantity. The matter is eaſily ſolved. The conſtitutions of theſe latter colonies are more favorable to univerſal induſtry.

But with all the differences between one colony and another, America in general, by its gradual improve-

ment, not long ago exhibited a ſpectacle, the moſt delightful that can be conceived, to a benevolent and contemplative mind. A country, growing every year in beauty and fertility, the people growing in numbers and wealth, arts and ſciences carefully cultivated and conſtantly advancing and poſſeſſing ſecurity of property by liberty and equal laws, which are the true and proper ſource of all the reſt. While things were in this ſituation, Great-Britain reaped a great, unenvied, and ſtill increaſing profit from the trade of the colonies. I am neither ſo weak as to believe, nor ſo fooliſh as to affirm, as ſome did in the beginning of this conteſt, that the colony trade was the whole ſupport of a majority of the people in Great-Britain. How could any perſon of reflection ſuppoſe that the foreign trade of three millions of people, could be the chief ſupport of eight millions, when the internal trade of theſe eight millions themſelves, is and muſt be the ſupport of double the number that could be ſupported by the trade of America, beſides their trade to every other part of the world? But our trade was ſtill of great importance and value, and yielded to Great-Britain yearly, a profit vaſtly ſuperior to any thing they could reaſonably hope to draw from taxes and impoſitions, although they had been ſubmitted to without complaint.

This however did not ſatisfy the king, miniſtry and parliament of Great-Britain. They formed golden, but miſtaken and deluſive hopes of lightening their own burdens by levying taxes from us. They formed various plans, and attempted various meaſures, not the moſt prudent I confeſs, for carrying their purpoſe into effect. The ultimate purpoſe itſelf was in ſome degree covered at firſt, and they hoped to bring it about by ſlow and imperceptible ſteps. In ſome inſtances the impoſition was in itſelf of little conſequence; as appointing the colonies to furniſh ſalt, pepper and vinegar to the troops. But the laudable and jealous ſpirit of liberty was alive and awake, and hardly ſuffered any of them to paſs unobſerved or unreſiſted. Public ſpirited writers took care that it ſhould not ſleep; and in particular the celebrated Pennſylvania Farmer's Letters were of ſignal ſervice, by furniſhing the

lovers of their country with facts, and illuſtrating the rights and privileges which it was their duty to defend.

The laſt attempt made by the miniſtry in the way of art and addreſs, was repealing the act laying duties on paper, glaſs, and painter's colors, and leaving a ſmall duty on tea, attended with ſuch circumſtances, that the tea ſhould come to us no dearer, but perhaps cheaper, than before. This was evidently with deſign that we might be induced to let it paſs, and ſo the claim having once taken place, might be carried in other inſtances to the greateſt height. This manœuvre, however, did not elude the vigilance of a public ſpirited people. The whole colonies declared their reſolution never to receive it. —

— — — — — —

THOUGHTS

ON

AMERICAN LIBERTY.

THE Congreſs is, properly ſpeaking, the repreſentative of the great body of the people of North America. Their election is for a particular purpoſe, and a particular ſeaſon only; it is quite diſtinct from the aſſemblies of the ſeveral provinces. What will be before them, is quite different from what was or could be in the view of the electors, when the aſſemblies are choſen. Therefore thoſe provinces are wrong, who committed it to the aſſembly as ſuch, to ſend delegates, though in ſome provinces, ſuch as Boſton and Virginia, and ſome others, the unanimity of ſentiment is ſuch, as to make it the ſame thing in effect.

It is at leaſt extremely uncertain, whether it could be proper or ſafe for the Congreſs to ſend either ambaſſadors, petition or addreſs, directly to king or parliament, or both. They may treat them as a diſorderly, unconſtitutional meeting—they may hold their meeting itſelf to be criminal—they may find ſo many objections in point of legal form, that it is plainly in the power of thoſe who wiſh to be able to do it, to deaden the zeal of the multitude in the colonies, by ambiguous, dilatory, frivolous anſwers, perhaps ſeverer meaſures. It is certain that this Congreſs is different from any regular exertion, in the accuſtomed forms of a quiet, approved, ſettled conſtitution. It is an

interruption or ſuſpenſion of the uſual forms, and an appeal to the great law of reaſon, the firſt principles of the ſocial union, and the multitude collectively, for whoſe benefit all the particular laws and cuſtoms of a conſtituted ſtate, are ſuppoſed to have been originally eſtabliſhed.

There is not the leaſt reaſon as yet, to think that either the king, the parliament, or even the people of Great-Britain, have been able to enter into the great principles of univerſal liberty, or are willing to hear the diſcuſſion of the point of right, without prejudice. They have not only taken no pains to convince us that ſubmiſſion to their claim is conſiſtent with liberty among us, but it is doubtful whether they expect or deſire we ſhould be convinced of it. It ſeems rather that they mean to force us to be abſolute ſlaves, knowing ourſelves to be ſuch by the hard law of neceſſity. If this is not their meaning, and they wiſh us to believe that our properties and lives are quite ſafe in the abſolute diſpoſal of the Britiſh Parliament, the late acts with reſpect to Boſton, to ruin their capital, deſtroy their charter, and grant the ſoldiers a licence to murder them, are certainly arguments of a very ſingular nature.

Therefore it follows, that the great object of the approaching Congreſs ſhould be to unite the colonies, and make them as one body, in any meaſure of ſelf-defence, to aſſure the people of Great-Britain that we will not ſubmit voluntarily, and convince them that it would be either impoſſible or unprofitable for them to compel us by open violence.

For this purpoſe, the following reſolutions and recommendations are ſubmitted to their conſideration :—

1. To profeſs as all the provincial and county rulers have done, our loyalty to the king, and our backwardneſs to break our connexion with Great-Britain, if we are not forced by their unjuſt impoſitions. Here it may not be improper to compare our paſt conduct with that of Great-Britain itſelf, and perhaps explicitly to profeſs our deteſtation of the virulent and inſolent abuſe of his majeſty's perſon and family, which ſo many have been guilty of in that iſland.

2. To declare, not only that we eſteem the claim of the Britiſh parliament to be illegal and unconſtitutional,

but that we are firmly determined never to ſubmit to it, and do deliberately prefer war with all its horrors, and even extermination itſelf to ſlavery, rivetted on us and our poſterity.

3. To reſolve that we will adhere to the intereſt of the whole body, and that no colony ſhall make its ſeparate peace, or from the hope of partial diſtinction, leave others as the victims of miniſterial vengeance, but that we will continue united, and purſue the ſame meaſures, till American liberty is ſettled on a ſolid baſis, and in particular till the now ſuffering colony of Maſſachuſetts Bay is reſtored to all the rights of which it has been, on this occaſion, unjuſtly deprived.

4. That a non-importation agreement, which has been too long delayed, ſhould be entered into immediately, and at the ſame time, a general non-conſumptive agreement, as to all Britiſh goods at leaſt, ſhould be circulated univerſally through the country, and take place immediately, that thoſe who have retarded the non-importation agreement, may not make a profit to themſelves by this injury to their country.

5. That ſome of the moſt effectual meaſures ſhould be taken to promote, not only induſtry in general, but manufactures in particular; ſuch as granting premiums in different colonies for manufactures which can be produced in them; appointing public markets for all the materials of manufacture; inviting over and encouraging able manufacturers in every branch; and appointing ſocieties in every great city, eſpecially in principal ſea-ports, to receive ſubſcriptions for directing and encouraging emigrants who ſhall come over from Europe, whether manufactures or laborers, and publiſhing propoſals for this purpoſe, in the Britiſh newſpapers.

6. That it be recommended to the legiſlature of every colony, to put their militia upon the beſt footing; and to all Americans to provide themſelves with arms, in caſe of a war with the Indians, French or Roman Catholics, or in caſe they ſhould be reduced to the hard neceſſity of defending themſelves from murder and aſſaſſination.

7. That a committee ſhould be appointed to draw up an earneſt and affectionate addreſs to the army and navy, putting them in mind of their character as Britons, the reproach which they will bring upon themſelves, and the danger to which they will be expoſed, if they allow themſelves to be the inſtruments of enſlaving their country.

8. That a plan of union ſhould be laid down for all the colonies, ſo that, as formerly, they may correſpond and aſcertain how they ſhall effectually co-operate in ſuch meaſures as ſhall be neceſſary to their common defence.

ON THE

CONTROVERSY

ABOUT

INDEPENDENCE.

SIR,

I BEG leave by your aſſiſtance, to publiſh a few thoughts upon the manner of conducting, what I think is now called the independent controverſy, in which this country in general is ſo greatly intereſted. Every one knows that when the claims of the Britiſh Parliament were openly made, and violently enforced, the moſt preciſe and determined reſolutions were entered into, and publiſhed by every colony, every county, and almoſt every townſhip or ſmaller diſtrict, that they would not ſubmit to them. This was clearly expreſſed in the greateſt part of them, and ought to be underſtood as the implied ſenſe of them all, not only that they would not *ſoon* or *eaſily*, but that they would *never* on *any event*, ſubmit to them. For my own part, I confeſs, I would never have ſigned theſe reſolves at firſt, nor taken up arms in conſequence of them afterwards, if I had not been fully convinced, as I am ſtill, that acquieſcence in this uſurped power, would be followed by the total and abſolute ruin of the colonies. They would have been no better than tributary ſtates to a kingdom at a great diſtance from them. They would have been there-

fore, as has been the caſe with all ſtates in a ſimilar ſituation from the beginning of the world, the ſervants of ſervants from generation to generation. For this reaſon I declare it to have been my meaning, and I know it was the meaning of thouſands more, that though we earneſtly wiſhed for reconciliation with ſafety to our liberties, yet we did deliberately prefer, not only the horrors of a civil war, not only the danger of anarchy, and the uncertainty of a new ſettlement, but even extermination itſelf to ſlavery, rivetted on us and our poſterity.

The moſt peaceable means were firſt uſed; but no relaxation could be obtained: one arbitrary and oppreſſive act followed after another; they deſtroyed the property of a whole capital—ſubverted to its very foundation, the conſtitution and government of a whole colony, and granted the ſoldiers a liberty of *murdering* in all the colonies. I expreſs it thus, becauſe they were not to be called to account for it where it was committed, which every body muſt allow was a temporary, and undoubtedly, in ninety-nine caſes of an hundred, muſt have iſſued in a total impunity. There is one circumſtance however in my opinion, much more curious than all the reſt. The reader will ſay, What can this be? It is the following, which I beg may be particularly attended to:—While all this was a doing, the King in his ſpeeches, the parliament in their acts, and the people of Great Britain in their addreſſes, never failed to extol their own lenity. I do not infer from this, that the King, Parliament and people of Great Britain are all barbarians and ſavages—the inference is unneceſſary and unjuſt: But I infer the miſery of the people of America, if they muſt ſubmit *in all cases whatsoever*, to the deciſions of a body of the ſons of Adam, ſo diſtant from them, and who have an intereſt in oppreſſing them. It has been my opinion from the beginning, that we did not carry our reaſoning fully home, when we complained of an arbitrary prince, or of the inſolence, cruelty and obſtinacy of Lord North, Lord Bute, or Lord Mansfield. What we have to fear, and what we have now to grapple with, is the ignorance, prejudice, partiality and injuſtice of human nature. Neither king nor miniſtry, could have done, nor durſt have

attempted what we have ſeen, if they had not had the nation on their ſide. The friends of America in England are few in number, and contemptible in influence; nor muſt I omit, that even of theſe few, not one, till very lately, ever reaſoned the American cauſe upon its proper principles, or viewed it in its proper light.

Petitions on petitions have been preſented to king and Parliament, and an addreſs ſent to the people of Great-Britain, which have been not merely fruitleſs, but treated with the higheſt degree of diſdain. The conduct of the Britiſh miniſtry during the whole of this conteſt, as has been often obſerved, has been ſuch, as to irritate the whole people of this continent to the higheſt degree, and unite them together by the firm bond of neceſſity and common intereſt. In this reſpect they have ſerved us in the moſt eſſential manner. I am firmly perſuaded, that had the wiſeſt heads in America met together to contrive what meaſures the miniſtry ſhould follow to ſtrengthen the American oppoſition and defeat their own deſigns, they could not have fallen upon a plan ſo effectual, as that which has been ſteadily purſued. One inſtance I cannot help mentioning, becauſe it was both of more importance, and leſs to be expected than any other. When a majority of the New-York Aſſembly, to their eternal infamy, attempted to break the union of the colonies, by refuſing to approve the proceedings of the Congreſs, and applying to Parliament by ſeparate petition—becauſe they preſumed to make mention of the principal grievance of taxation, it was treated with ineffable contempt. I deſire it may be obſerved, that all thoſe who are called the friends of America in Parliament, pleaded ſtrongly for receiving the New-York petition; which plainly ſhewed, that neither the one nor the other underſtood the ſtate of affairs in America. Had the miniſtry been prudent, or the oppoſition ſucceſsful, we had been ruined; but with what tranſport did every friend to American liberty hear, that theſe traitors to the common cauſe, had met with the reception which they deſerved.

Nothing is more manifeſt, than that the people of Great-Britain, and even the king and miniſtry, have been hither-

to exceedingly ignorant of the ſtate of things in America. For this reaſon, their meaſures have been ridiculous in the higheſt degree, and the iſſue diſgraceful. There are ſome who will not believe that they are ignorant—they tell us, how can this be? Have they not multitudes in this country, who gave them intelligence from the beginning? Yes they have; but they would truſt none but what they called official intelligence, that is to ſay, from obſequious, intereſted tools of government; many of them knew little of the true ſtate of things themſelves, and when they did, would not tell it, leſt it ſhould be diſagreeable. I have not a very high opinion of the integrity and candor of Dr. C———, Dr. C———, and other mercenary writers in New-York; yet I firmly believe, that they thought the friends of American liberty much more inconſiderable, both for weight and numbers, than they were. They converſed with few, but thoſe of their own way of thinking, and according to the common deception of little minds, miſtook the ſentiments prevailing within the circle of their own acquaintance, for the judgment of the public.

ON

CONDUCTING

THE

AMERICAN CONTROVERSY.

SIR,

I TAKE the liberty, by means of your free and uninfluenced preſs, of communicating to the public a few remarks upon the manner of conducting the American controverſy in general, and on ſome of the writers that have appeared in your paper in particular. That you may not paſs ſentence upon me immediately as an enemy to the royal authority, and a ſon of ſedition, I declare that I eſteem his majeſty king George the third to have the only rightful and lawful title to the Britiſh crown, which was ſettled upon his family in conſequence of the glorious revolution. You will ſay, this is nothing at all; it is the creed of the factious Boſtonians. I will then go a little further, and ſay that I not only revere him as the firſt magiſtrate of the realm, but I love and honor him as a man, and am perſuaded that he wiſhes the proſperity and happineſs of his people in every part of his dominions. Nay, I have ſtill more to ſay, I do not think the Britiſh miniſtry themſelves have deſerved all the abuſe and foul names that have been beſtowed on them by political wri-

ters. The ſteps which they have taken with reſpect to American affairs, and which I eſteem to be unjuſt, impolitic, and barbarous to the higheſt degree, have been chiefly owing to the two following cauſes. 1. Ignorance or miſtake, occaſioned by the miſinformation of intereſted and treacherous perſons employed in their ſervice. 2. The prejudices common to them, with perſons of all ranks in the iſland of Great-Britain.

Of the firſt of theſe, I ſhall ſay nothing at preſent, becauſe perhaps it may occur with as great propriety afterwards. But as to the ſecond, there is to be found in the newſpapers enough to convince every man of reflection, that it was not the king and the miniſtry only, but the whole nation that was enraged againſt America. The tide is but juſt beginning to turn; and I am in ſome doubt whether it has fairly turned yet, upon any larger principles than a regard to their own intereſt, which may be affected by our proceedings. It can hardly be expected, that the eyes of a whole nation ſhould be at once opened upon the generous principles of univerſal liberty. It is natural for the multitude in Britain, who have been from their infancy taught to look upon an act of parliament as ſupreme and irreſiſtible, and to conſider the liberty of their country itſelf as conſiſting in the dominion of the houſe of commons, to be ſurpriſed and aſtoniſhed at any ſociety or body of men, calling in queſtion the authority of parliament, and denying its power over them. It certainly required time to make them ſenſible that things are in ſuch a ſituation in America, that for the houſe of commons in Great Britain to aſſume the uncontrouled power of impoſing taxes upon American property, would be as inconſiſtent with the ſpirit of the Britiſh conſtitution, as it appears at firſt ſight agreeable to its form. It argues great ignorance of human nature to ſuppoſe, that becauſe we ſee a thing clearly, which we contemplate every day, and which it is our intereſt to believe and maintain, therefore they are deſtitute of honor and truth who do not acknowledge it immediately, though all their former ideas and habits have led them to a contrary ſuppoſition. A man will become an American by reſiding in the country three

months, with a proſpect of continuing, more eaſily and certainly than by reading or hearing of it for three years, amidſt the ſophiſtry of daily diſputation.

For theſe reaſons, I have often been grieved to ſee that the pleaders for American liberty, have mixed ſo much of abuſe and invective againſt the miniſtry in general, as well as particular perſons, with their reaſonings in ſupport of their own moſt righteous claim. I have often ſaid to friends of America, on that ſubject, it is not the king and miniſtry, ſo much as the prejudices of Britons, with which you have to contend. Spare no pains to have them fully informed. Add to the immoveable firmneſs with which you juſtly ſupport your own rights, a continual ſolicitude to convince the people of Britain, that it is not paſſion but reaſon that inſpires you. Tell them it cannot be ambition, but neceſſity, that makes you run an evident riſk of the heavieſt ſufferings, rather than forfeit for yourſelves and your poſterity, the greateſt of all earthly bleſſings.

Another circumſtance gave me ſtill more uneaſineſs, viz. that many American patriots ſeemed to countenance, and to think themſelves intereſted in the proſperity of that moſt deſpicable of all factions that ever exiſted in the Britiſh empire, headed by the celebrated John Wilkes, eſq. That ſhameleſs gang carried on their attacks with ſuch groſs, and indecent, and groundleſs abuſe of the king and his family, that they became odious to the nation, and indeed ſo contemptible, that the miniſtry ſent at one time the lord mayor of London to the tower, without exciting the leaſt reſentment in the perſons of property in that great city, ſo as to be felt in the operations of the treaſury.

I am ſenſible, and I mention it with pleaſure, that no American ever proceeded to ſuch offenſive extravagance on theſe ſubjects, as the people in Britain. Far greater inſults were offered to the ſovereign, within the city of London, and within the verge of the court, than ever were thought of, or would have been permitted, by the mob in any part of America. Even the writings containing illiberal abuſe from England, were ſcarcely ſought after here,

and many of them never publiſhed, although it could have been done without the leaſt danger of a proſecution. Yet, though the people of America are as dutiful and reſpectful ſubjects to the king as any in his dominions, there were ſome things done, and ſome things publiſhed, that ſeemed to intimate that we had one and the ſame cauſe with the author of the North-Britain, No. 45. The evil conſequence of this was, that it had a tendency to lead the king and miniſtry to think that the American claim was no better than the Wilkite clamor, and ſo to oppoſe it with the ſame firmneſs, and to treat it with the ſame diſdain. Nothing could be more injudicious than this conduct in the Americans; and it aroſe from the moſt abſolute ignorance of political hiſtory. The ſtamp-act, that firſt-born of American oppreſſions, was framed by the chief men of that very faction; and it is plain from their language to this hour, that they make no other uſe of American diſturbances, but as engines of oppoſition, and to ſerve the mean purpoſes of party or of family intereſt.

I do not mean by this to take any part with or againſt the preſent miniſtry. I have ſeen many changes of the miniſtry, without any ſenſible change of the ſtate of public affairs. Nothing is more common with them than to raiſe a hideous outcry againſt a meaſure, when they are out, and yet, without ſhame or conſcience, do the very ſame thing as ſoon as they get in. I look upon the cauſe of America at preſent to be a matter of truly inexpreſſible moment. The ſtate of the human race through a great part of the globe, for ages to come, depends upon it. Any miniſter or miniſtry, who is in or out of court favor, at a particular juncture, is ſo little a matter, that it ſhould not be named with it. — — —

— — — — — —

ARISTIDES.

SIR,

I HAVE a few thoughts to communicate, firſt to yourſelf, and after that, if you pleaſe to the public, upon the manner of conducting what is now called the independent controverſy, in the newſpapers. There are to be found in the tracts upon one ſide of this queſtion, almoſt without exception, complaints of ſome reſtraints, felt or feared, upon the freedom of the preſs. I ſhall be glad to be informed, becauſe I am yet ignorant, what foundation there is for theſe complaints. A pamphlet was publiſhed ſometime ago, calling itſelf Common Senſe, which nobody was obliged to read, but thoſe who were willing to pay for it, and that pretty dearly too. It was however read very generally, which I ſuppoſe muſt have ariſen either from the beauty and elegance of the compoſition, or from the truth and importance of the matter contained in it. That it did not ariſe from the firſt of theſe cauſes, I ſhall take for granted, until I meet with ſomebody who is of a different opinion; and when this is added to the circumſtance of its being ſold in the manner above mentioned, it is plain that the ſubject matter of Common Senſe was propoſed to the world under every diſadvantage, but that of its own manifeſt importance and apparent truth or probability.

Things being in this ſituation, after time ſufficient to have matured any pamphlet of an ordinary ſize, out comes an anſwer to *Common Sense*, under the title of

Plain Truth. This in one reſpect, was perfectly fair, for it was pamphlet againſt pamphlet; and the ſaid Plain Truth alſo was ſold, as well as Common Senſe, at a very high price. For this laſt circumſtance, there was no need of aſſigning a reaſon, becauſe I apprehend it is the undoubted right of every author, to ſet what price he pleaſes upon the productions of his genius, and of every printer upon the productions of his preſs, leaving it always to the public to determine whether they will purchaſe theſe productions at that price, or any other. A reaſon however was aſſigned, which was as ſingular as it was unneceſſary. We were told that only a ſmall number of copies was printed of the *first* edition, I believe this is the only inſtance that can be produced, of calling a book in its publication, the firſt edition. The only reaſon of making more editions than one of any book, is the ſpeedy ſale of that number of copies, which the modeſty of the author, or the prudence of the bookſeller, thought might be ſufficient for the public demand. In this caſe, there is what is ſtated by the printers a *call* for another edition. But there are multitudes of publications, as to which this call is never heard, and therefore none of them can, with propriety of ſpeech be ſtiled the firſt edition. How would it ſound if I ſhould ſay, that a man who came alone into my houſe, was the firſt of the company that entered; or that my wife, who is ſtill alive and well, is my firſt wife, when it is very poſſible that ſhe may live till I am unfit for any other wife, or till ſhe is at liberty to take a ſecond huſband?

But further, ſuppoſing that the author and bookſeller had been right in that expectation, which the uſe of the phraſe plainly ſhews the vanity of the one and the miſtake of the other had raiſed in them, I deſire to know how that was a reaſon for printing few copies, and thus rendering them unconſcionably dear. You printers know beſt, but I take it for granted from the nature of the thing, that you print feweſt copies of a book, when you do not expect a general ſale. If I were certain that this diſſertation of mine would cauſe an unuſual demand for the paper that contains it, I would modeſtly ſuggeſt to you, to print three

or four hundred of that number more than common. In like manner, if it was certain at the appearance of this pamphlet, that it would be the firſt of many editions, following one another in rapid ſucceſſion, it ſeems the moſt obvious thing in the world that the edition ſhould have been as large as poſſible. Upon the whole, this was an unlucky ſtumble at the threſhold in the author of Plain Truth, as well as an unexpected *lapsus* of the great, illuſtrious, and exalted R. B. providore, as he calls himſelf, to the ſentimentaliſts, for which I find no way of accounting, but that they were inadvertently led by the ſubject they had in hand to act, as well as write, in direct oppoſition to Common *Senſe*.

Well, the book comes out, of which I had a preſent of two copies, from different perſons, notwithſtanding the ſmallneſs of the number printed. But what ſhall I ſay, either of the ſtyle or reaſoning of the performance. The reading of three pages gave me the opinion of it, which all who read it afterwards concurred in, and which all who have not read it, eaſily acquieſced in. In execution it was ſo contemptible, that it could not procure a reading on a ſubject, as to which, the curioſity of the public was raiſed to the greateſt height; it not only wanted good qualities in point of taſte and propriety, but was eminently poſſeſſed of every bad one. Common Senſe ſometimes failed in grammar, but never in perſpicuity. Plain Truth was ſo ridiculouſly ornamented with vapid, ſenſeleſs phraſes and feeble epithets, that his meaning could hardly be comprehended. He often put me in mind of the painted windows of ſome old gothic buildings, which keep out the light. If Common Senſe in ſome places wanted poliſh, Plain Truth was covered over, from head to foot, with a deteſtable and ſtinking varniſh.

As to the argument itſelf, although nothing could be more clearly ſtated than it was in Common Senſe, yet in Plain Truth it was never touched upon in the leaſt degree. The author of Common Senſe did not write his book to ſhew that we ought to reſiſt the unconſtitutional claims of Great Britain, which we had all determined to do long before; he wrote it to ſhew that we ought not to ſeek or

wait for a reconciliation, which in his opinion, is now become both impracticable and unprofitable, but to eſtabliſh a fixed regular government, and provide for ourſelves—Plain Truth on the contrary, never attempts to ſhew that there is the leaſt probability of obtaining reconciliation on ſuch terms as will preſerve and ſecure our liberties, but has exerted all his little force, to prove, that ſuch is the ſtrength of Great Britain, that it will be in vain for us to reſiſt at all. I will refer it to the impartial judgment of all who have read this treatiſe, whether the juſt and proper inference from his reaſoning is not, that we ought immediately to ſend an embaſſy with ropes about their necks, to make a full and humble ſurrender of ourſelves and all our property to the diſpoſal of the parent ſtate. This they have formally and explicitly demanded of us, and this we have with equal clearneſs determined we will never do. The queſtion then is; Shall we make reſiſtance with the greateſt force, as rebel ſubjects of a government which we acknowledge, or as independent ſtates againſt an uſurped power which we deteſt and abhor.

After this reprobated author was off the ſtage, a new ſet of antagoniſts appeared againſt Common Senſe? but inſtead of publiſhing the firſt edition of pamphlets, they choſe to appear in the newſpapers. The propriety of this I beg leave to examine. Much has been ſaid about the liberty of the preſs; ſuffer me to ſay a few words for the liberty of readers. When a pamphlet is publiſhed and ſold, nobody is wronged. When the anſwer to it is publiſhed and ſold, the thing is quite fair. The writers and their cauſe will undergo an impartial trial; but when the anſwering one pamphlet by another, has ſo ſhamefully failed, to undertake the ſame thing by various detached pieces in the newſpapers, is cramming the ſenſe or nonſenſe of theſe authors down our throats, whether we will or not. I pay for your newſpaper, and for two more, and frequently read others beſides. Now, if I pay for news, muſt my paper be ſtuffed with diſſertations, and muſt I read them four or five times over? I do declare, that I have paid, and am to pay, three times for the moſt part of Cato's letters, and if they were to be publiſhed in

a pamphlet, I would not give a rush for them all together. But it will be said, the custom is old and universal, to write dissertations in newspapers. I answer, it is both old, universal and useful, when under proper direction; but it may be abused. It is the right of every publisher of a newspaper, to insert in it upon his own judgment and choice, when news are scarce, whatever he thinks will recommend his paper to his readers. In this view, an able writer is a treasure to a publisher of any periodical paper, and ought certainly to be paid liberally, either in money or thanks, or both; and therefore, Sir, if you have paid for, or even solicited from the author, the papers you have published, you are wholly acquitted of blame, further than sometimes a mistaken choice; but if on the contrary, which I strongly suspect, you and others are paid for inserting political pieces, I affirm, you take money to deceive your readers.

As the subject is of some importance, especially at this time, I shall take the liberty of stating the objections I have against the practice, as above described, leaving you to shape your future course as you think proper, and determining to use my prerogative of taking or giving up your paper as it seems to deserve. In the first place, if you admit pieces into your paper for pay, I presume from the nature of all mankind, that those who pay best, will have the preference. Then shall we have a new standard of literary merit; and a man who is able and willing to refute pernicious principles, or to detect the falsehood of impudent assertions, may yet be too poor to obtain a place, where only it can be done to any good purposes. The moment it is in the power of persons unknown, to conduct or bias the public channels of intelligence, both the people in general, and particular persons, may be deceived and abused in the grossest manner. It is scarce worth while, when things of so much greater moment are to be added, yet I will just mention, that you force nonsense upon us which could not make its appearance in any other mode of publication. Pray Sir, how much copy money would you have given for a pamphlet in which you had found that ridiculous pun upon Mount Seir, which is to be seen

in one of Cato's letters, and the wretched parody upon Hamlet's ſoliloquy? Parody in general, is one of the loweſt kind of writing that has yet found a name; and that poor ſpeech has been repeated, imitated and mangled ſo often, that it muſt excite diſguſt in every perſon who has any acquaintance with newſpapers and pamphlets to ſee it again. I could eaſily mention twenty different ways, in which I have ſeen that ſpeech parodied. To ſpeak, or not to ſpeak, that is the queſtion—To fight, or not to fight, that is the queſtion—To wed, or not to wed, that is the queſtion—To drink, or not to drink, that is the queſtion, &c. &c. &c. Is this then a time for filling the newſpapers with ſuch egregious trifling?

But this is not all; I could mention a caſe that happened a few years ago in New-York. A gentleman had publiſhed a ſmall piece by itſelf, and put his own name and deſcription on the title page; he was immediately attacked in the moſt virulent and unmannerly ſtile, by anonymous writers in the newſpapers, and it was with the utmoſt difficulty, that even for pay itſelf, his friends could get a few words inſerted by way of reply. This practice indeed, is liable to the higheſt degree of corruption. Whether are we to ſuppoſe it was pay or profaneneſs, that introduced into the paper printed by the infamous R———, pieces containing the groſſeſt obſcenity, and which ought to have peen puniſhed by the magiſtrates of the place, as a public nuiſance? It is alſo generally believed of that printer, that he encouraged or hired worthleſs perſons to publiſh aſperſions againſt a gentleman in the neighbourhood, of good eſtate, but of no great judgment, that he might ſqueeze money out of him for the liberty of contradicting them. I do not ſay that things are come this length with you; but the practice leads to it, and therefore ſhould be early and vigorouſly oppoſed.

For the above reaſons, caution is to be uſed in admitting eſſays into the newſpapers at any rate, or ſuffering a controverſy in which people are greatly intereſted, to be agitated there at all. The writers are very apt to become perſonal and abuſive, and to forget the ſubject by refuting or expoſing every thing that has been thrown out by their

antagoniſts. Certainly however, they ought to confine themſelves to the pieces that have been originally publiſhed in the newſpapers, and are ſuppoſed to have been read by the ſame perſons who read the anſwers. To anſwer a whole book by a ſeries of letters in the newſpapers, is like attacking a man behind his back, and ſpeaking to his prejudice before perſons who never ſaw nor heard of him, nor are ever likely ſo to do. Common Senſe has been read by many, yet the newſpapers are read by many more; and therefore I affirm, that permitting his adverſaries to attack him there, is giving them an undue advantage over him, and laying the public at the mercy of thoſe who will not ſtick to aſſert any thing whatever, in ſupport of a bad cauſe.

Let no body ſay I am writing againſt the freedom of the preſs. I deſire that it ſhould be perfectly free from every bias; but I would have all writings of conſequence upon ſuch a cauſe as this, publiſhed by themſelves, that they may ſtand or fall by their own merit, and the judgment of the public. How do you think Sir, the letter of the *common man* publiſhed in your paper, ſome time ago, would do if lengthened out a little, and printed in a pamphlet? Under a thin and ſilly pretence of impartiality, he takes upon him to tell us what a number of things muſt be all previouſly ſettled, before we proceed to fix upon a regular plan of government; ſuch as what price we muſt expect for our produce at this and the other nation and port. Shall we call this reaſoning? Are our underſtandings to be inſulted? If all or any ſuch things muſt be previouſly ſettled, any man of common invention may enumerate fifty thouſand perfectly ſimilar, which will never be ſettled by previous computation to the end of the world, but will ſpeedily ſettle themſelves by common intereſt, when a trade is open, and the common man ſhall never know any thing of the matter.

But what I chiefly complain of, is the tedious, trifling, indecent altercation, occaſioned by handling this ſubject in the newſpapers. It certainly requires a ſpeedy deciſion, as well as mature deliberation; yet muſt we wait till Cato and other writers have exhauſted their invention in the

newſpapers, from week to week, gueſſed at one another's perſons, and triumphantly expreſſed their diſdain at each other's ſentiments or ſtile. If Cato's letters had been a pamphlet, I could have read all that he has ſaid in an hour, and all the reaſoning part by itſelf, in the fourth part of the time; yet after eight letters, muſt we wait ſome weeks more, for it would be indecent to proceed to action before he has done ſpeaking. But after all, the worſt of it is, that in this way of letter and anſwer, we never come to the argument at all. If I miſtake not, the points to be diſcuſſed are very plain and not numerous, and yet wholly untouched, at leaſt by Cato, though he has been repeatedly called upon by his adverſaries. For example—Is there a probable proſpect of reconciliation on conſtitutional principles? What are theſe conſtitutional principles? Will any body ſhew that Great-Britain can be ſufficiently ſure of our dependance, and yet we ſure of our liberties? A treatiſe upon this laſt ſubject would be highly acceptable to me, and if well executed, uſeful to all. I ſhall add but one queſtion more. Will the country be as orderly and happy, and our efforts for reſiſtance as effectual, by the preſent looſe and temporary proceedings, as when the whole are united by a firm confederacy, and their exertions concentrated like the ſtrength of a ſingle ſtate? I am greatly miſtaken if theſe points ought not to be the hinge of the controverſy, and yet if they have been examined fully, or the greateſt part of them even touched upon by Cato or his coadjutors, I have read their works with very little attention.

Now, Sir, this paper goes to you, that if you pleaſe you may inſert it, but neither money nor promiſe of good deed to make way for it, ſo that its fate is wholly uncertain.

I remain Sir,

Yours, &c.

ARISTIDES.

PART OF A

SPEECH IN CONGRESS,

ON THE

CONFERENCE

PROPOSED BY LORD HOWE.

Mr. PRESIDENT,

THE ſubject we are now upon, is felt and confeſſed by us all to be of the utmoſt conſequence, and perhaps I may alſo ſay, of delicacy and difficulty. I have not been accuſtomed in ſuch caſes to make ſolemn profeſſions of impartiality; and ſhall not do it now, becauſe I will not ſuppoſe that there are any ſuſpicions to the contrary in the minds of thoſe who hear me. Beſides, the variety of opinions that have been formed and delivered upon it, ſeem to prove that we are giving our own proper judgment, without prejudice or influence; which I hope will lead to the diſcovery of what is moſt wiſe and expedient upon the whole.

As the deliberation ariſes from a meſſage ſent to us by lord Howe, at leaſt by his permiſſion, I think it is of importance to attend with greater exactneſs to all the circumſtances of that meſſage, than has been done by any gentleman who has yet ſpoken on the ſubject. It comes

from the commander in chief of the forces of the king of Great-Britain, and one who is ſaid to carry a commiſſion to give peace to America.

From the conduct of the miniſtry at home, from the acts of parliament, and from lord Howe's proclamation in conformity to both, it is plain, that abſolute unconditional ſubmiſſion is what they require us to agree to, or mean to force us to. And from the moſt authentic private intelligence, the king has not laid aſide his perſonal rancor; it is rather increaſing every day. In theſe circumſtances, lord Howe has evidently a great deſire to engage us in a treaty; and yet he has conſtantly avoided giving up the leaſt punctilio on his ſide. He could never be induced to give general Waſhington his title. He plainly tells us he cannot treat with Congreſs as ſuch; but he has allowed a priſoner of war to come and tell us he would be glad to ſee us as private gentlemen.

It has been ſaid that this is no inſult or diſgrace to the Congreſs; that the point of honor is hard to be got over, in making the firſt advances. This, ſir, is miſtaking the matter wholly. He has got over this point of honor; he has made the firſt overtures; he has told general Waſhington, by colonel Putnam, that he wiſhed that meſſage to be conſidered as making the firſt ſtep. His renewed attempts by lord Drummond, and now by general Sullivan, point out to all the world that he has made the firſt ſtep. It will doubtleſs be related at home, and I am of opinion it is already written and boaſted of to the miniſtry at home, that he has taken ſuch a part. Therefore, any evil or condeſcenſion that can attend ſeeking peace firſt, has been ſubmitted to by him. Yet has he uniformly avoided any circumſtance that can imply that we are any thing elſe but ſubjects of the king of Great-Britain, in rebellion. Such a meſſage as this, if in any degree intended as reſpectful to us, ought to have been ſecret; yet has it been open as the day. In ſhort, ſuch a meſſage was unneceſſary; for if he meant only to communicate his mind to the Congreſs by private gentlemen, he might have done that many ways, and it needed not to have been known either to the public or the Congreſs, till theſe

private gentlemen came here on purpoſe to reveal it.—Theſe, then, are the circumſtances which attend this meſſage as it is now before us; and the queſtion is, ſhall we comply with it in any degree, or not? Let us aſk what benefit will be derived from it? There is none yet ſhewn to be poſſible. It has been admitted by every perſon without exception who has ſpoken, that we are not to admit a thought of giving up the independence we have ſo lately declared; and by the greateſt part, if not the whole, that there is not the leaſt reaſon to expect that any correſpondence we can have with him will tend to peace. Yet I think, in the beginning of the debate, ſuch reaſonings were uſed as ſeemed to me only to conclude that we ſhould graſp at it as a means of peace. We were told that it was eaſy for us to boaſt or be valiant here; but that our armies were running away before their enemies. I never loved boaſting, neither here nor any where elſe. I look upon it as almoſt a certain forerunner of diſgrace. I found my hope of ſucceſs in this cauſe, not in the valor of Americans, or the cowardice of Britons, but upon the juſtice of the cauſe, and ſtill more upon the nature of things. Britain has firſt injured and inflamed America to the higheſt degree; and now attempts, at the diſtance of three thouſand miles, to carry on war with this whole country, and force it to abſolute ſubmiſſion. If we take the whole events of the war ſince it commenced, we ſhall rather wonder at the uniformity of our ſucceſs, than be ſurpriſed at ſome croſs events. We have ſeen bravery as well as cowardice in this country; and there are no conſequences of either that are probable, that can be worth mentioning, as aſcertaining the event of the conteſt.

Lord Howe ſpeaks of a deciſive blow not being yet ſtruck; as if this cauſe depended upon one battle, which could not be avoided. Sir, this is a prodigious miſtake. We may fight no battle at all for a long time, or we may loſe ſome battles, as was the caſe with the Britiſh themſelves in the Scotch rebellion of 1745, and the cauſe notwithſtanding be the ſame. I wiſh it were conſidered, that neither loſs nor diſgrace worth mentioning, has befallen us in the late engagement, nor comparable to what the Britiſh troops

have often ſuffered. At the battle of Preſton, ſir, they broke to pieces and ran away like ſheep, before a few highlanders. I myſelf ſaw them do the ſame thing at Falkirk, with very little difference, a ſmall part only of the army making a ſtand, and in a few hours the whole retreating with precipitation before their enemies. Did that make any difference in the cauſe? Not in the leaſt—ſo long as the body of the nation were determined, on principle, againſt the rebels. Nor would it have made any other difference, but in time, though they had got poſſeſſion of London, which they might have eaſily done if they had underſtood their buſineſs; for the militia in England there gathered together, behaved fifty times worſe than that of America has done lately. They generally diſbanded and ran off wholly, as ſoon as the rebels came within ten or twenty miles of them. In ſhort, ſir, from any thing that has happened, I ſee not the leaſt reaſon for our attending to this deluſive meſſage. On the contrary, I think it is the very worſt time that could be choſen for us; as it will be looked upon as the effect of fear, and diffuſe the ſame ſpirit, in ſome degree, through different ranks of men.

The improbability of any thing ariſing from this conference, leading to a juſt and honorable peace, might be ſhewn by arguments too numerous to be even ſo much as named. But what I ſhall only mention is, that we are abſolutely certain, from every circumſtance, from all the proceedings at home, and lord Howe's own explicit declaration in his letter to Dr. Franklin, that he never will acknowledge the independence of the American States.

I obſerved that one or two members ſaid, in objection to the report of the board of war, that it was like a begging of the queſtion, and making a preliminary of the whole ſubject in debate. Alas, ſir, this is a prodigious miſtake. It was not only not the whole, but it was properly no ſubject of debate at all, till within theſe three months. We were contending for the reſtoration of certain privileges under the government of Great-Britain, and we were praying for re-union with her. But in the beginning of July, with the univerſal approbation of all the ſtates now united,

we renounced this connexion, and declared ourselves free and independent. Shall we bring this into question again? Is it not a preliminary? has it not been declared a preliminary by many gentlemen, who have yet given their opinion for a conference, while they have said they were determined on no account, and on no condition, to give up our independence? It is then a necessary preliminary—and it is quite a different thing from any punctilios of ceremony. If France and England were at war, and they were both desirous of peace, there might be some little difficulty as to who should make the first propofals; but if one of them should claim the other, as they did long ago, as a vassal or dependant subject, and should signify a desire to converse with the other, or some deputed by him, and propose him many privileges, so as to make him even better than before, I desire to know how such a propofal would be received? If we had been for ages an independent republic, we should feel this argument with all its force. That we do not feel it, shews that we have not yet acquired the whole ideas and habits of independence; from which I only infer, that every step taken in a correspondence as now propofed, will be a virtual or partial renunciation of that dignity so lately acquired.

I beg you would observe, sir, that lord Howe himself was fully sensible that the declaration of independence precluded any treaty, in the character in which he appeared: as he is said to have lamented that he had not arrived ten days sooner, before that declaration was made. Hence it appears, that entering into any correspondence with him in the manner now propofed, is actually giving up, or at least subjecting to a new consideration, the independence which we have declared. If I may be allowed to say it without offence, it seems to me that some members have unawares admitted this, though they are not sensible of it; for when they say that it is refusing to treat, unless the whole be granted us, they must mean that some part of that whole must be left to be discussed and obtained, or yielded, by the treaty.

But, sir, many members of this house have either yielded, or at least supposed, that no desirable peace, or no real

good, could be finally expected from this correſpondence, which is wiſhed to be ſet on foot; but they have conſidered it as neceſſary in the eye of the public, to ſatisfy them that we are always ready to hear any thing that will reſtore peace to the country. In this view it is conſidered as a ſort of trial of ſkill between lord Howe and us, in the political art. As I do truly believe, that many members of this houſe are determined by this circumſtance, I ſhall conſider it with ſome attention. With this view it will be neceſſary to diſtinguiſh the public in America into three great claſſes. (1.) The tories, our ſecret enemies. (2.) The whigs, the friends of independence, our ſincere and hearty ſupporters. (3.) The army, who muſt fight for us.

As to the firſt of them, I readily admit that they are earneſt for our treating. They are exulting in the proſpect of it; they are ſpreading innumerable lies to forward it. They are treating the whigs already with inſult and inſolence upon it. It has brought them from their lurking holes; they have taken liberty to ſay things in conſequence of it, which they durſt not have ſaid before. In one word, if we ſet this negociation on foot, it will give new force and vigor to all their ſeditious machinations. But, ſir, ſhall their devices have any influence upon us at all; if they have at all, it ſhould be to make us ſuſpect that ſide of the queſtion which they embrace. In caſes where the expediency of a meaſure is doubtful, if I had an opportunity of knowing what my enemies wiſhed me to do, I would not be eaſily induced to follow their advice.

As to the whigs and friends of independence, I am well perſuaded that multitudes of them are already clear in their minds, that the conference ſhould be utterly rejected; and to thoſe who are in doubt about its nature, nothing more will be requiſite, than a clear and full information of the ſtate of the caſe, which I hope will be granted them.

As to the army, I cannot help being of opinion, that nothing will more effectually deaden the operations of war, than what is propoſed. We do not ourſelves ex-

pect any benefit from it, but they will. And they will poſſibly impute our conduct to fear and jealouſy as to the iſſue of the cauſe; which will add to their preſent little diſcouragement, and produce a timorous and deſpondent ſpirit. — — — — —

— — — — — —

SPEECH IN CONGRESS,

ON THE

CONVENTION

WITH

GENERAL BURGOYNE.

MR. PRESIDENT,

I AM ſenſible, as every other gentleman in this houſe ſeems to be, of the great importance of the preſent queſtion. It is of much moment, as to private perſons, ſo to every incorporated ſociety, to preſerve its faith and honor in ſolemn contracts: and it is eſpecially ſo to us, as repreſenting the United States of America, aſſociated ſo lately, and juſt beginning to appear upon the public ſtage. I hope, therefore, we ſhall deteſt the thoughts of embracing any meaſure which ſhall but appear to be mean, captious, or inſidious, whatever advantage may ſeem to ariſe from it. On the other hand, as the intereſt of this continent is committed to our care, it is our duty, and it will be expected of us, that we give the utmoſt attention that the public ſuffer no injury by deception, or abuſe and inſult, on the part of our enemies.

On the firſt of theſe principles, it is clearly my opinion that we ought, agreeably to the ſpirit of the firſt reſolution reported, to find, that the convention is not ſo broken, on the part of general Burgoyne, as to entitle us to refuſe compliance

with it on ours, and detain him and his army as prisoners of war. I admit that there is something very suspicious in the circumstance of the colours, when compared with his letter in the London Gazette, which makes mention of the British colours being seen flying upon the fort. I agree, at the same time, that the pretence of the cartouch boxes not being mentioned in the convention, is plainly an evasion. They ought, in fair construction, to be comprehended under more expressions of that capitulation than one—arms—ammunition—warlike stores. They were so understood at the capitulation of St. John's. In this present instance many of them were delivered up, which certainly ought to have been the case with all or none. And once more, I admit that the detention of the bayonets in the instances in which it was done, was undeniably unjust.

As to the first of these particulars, I am unwilling to distrust the honour of a gentleman solemnly given; and therefore as general Burgoyne has given his honor to general Gates, that the colours were left in Canada, I suppose it is substantially true, whatever small exception there might be to it. The colours seen flying at Tyconderoga, were perhaps old colours occasionally found there, or perhaps taken from some of the vessels lying at the place, and left there when the army proceeded further up the country. This is the rather probable, that if the regiments in general had had colours, they must have been seen very frequently by our army in the battles, or upon the march.

As to the other circumstances, they are so mean and little in their nature, that I suppose them to have arisen from the indiscretion of individuals, quite unknown to the commander in chief, or even to the officers in general.

We ought also to consider that it was so unexpected, and must have been so humiliating a thing, for a whole British army to surrender their arms, and deliver themselves up prisoners to those of whom they had been accustomed to speak with such contempt and disdain—that it is not to be wondered at, if the common soldiers did some things out of spite and ill humor, not to be justified. To

all theſe conſiderations, I will only add, that though the want of the colours deprives us of ſome enſigns of triumph which it would have been very grateful to the different ſtates to have diſtributed among them, and to have preſerved as monuments of our victory, the other things are ſo trifling and uneſſential, that it would probably be conſidered as taking an undue advantage, if we ſhould retain the whole army here on that account. I would therefore, ſir, have it clearly aſſerted, that though we are not inſenſible of thoſe irregularities, and they may contribute to make us attentive to what ſhall hereafter paſs before the embarkation, we do not conſider them as ſuch breaches of the convention, as will authorize us in juſtice to declare it void.

On the other hand, ſir, it is our indiſpenſable duty to uſe the greateſt vigilance, and to act with the greateſt firmneſs, in ſeeing that juſtice be done to the American States. Not only caution, but what I may call jealouſy and ſuſpicion, is neither unreaſonable nor indecent in ſuch a caſe. This will be juſtified by the knowledge of mankind. Hiſtory affords us many examples of evaſive and artful conduct in ſome of the greateſt men and moſt reſpectable nations, when hard preſſed by their neceſſities, or when a great advantage was in view. The behaviour of the Romans when their army was taken at the Caudine Forks may be produced as one. The conduct of the Samnites was not over-wiſe; but that of the Romans was diſhonorable to the laſt degree, though there are civilians who defend it. Their conſul, after his army had paſſed through the yoke, a ſymbol at that time of the utmoſt infamy, made a peace with the Samnites. The ſenate refuſed to ratify it; but kept up a ſhew of regard to the faith plighted, by delivering up the conſul to the Samnites, to be uſed as they thought proper. That people anſwered, as was eaſily ſuggeſted by plain common ſenſe, that it was no reparation at all to them to torment or put one man to death; but that if they diſavowed the treaty, they ought to ſend back the army to the ſame ſpot of ground in which they had been ſurrounded. No ſuch thing, however, was done. But the Romans, notwithſtanding, immediately broke the

league ; and with the ſame army which had been let go, or a great part of it, brought the unhappy Samnites to deſtruction.—Such inſtances may be brought from modern as well as ancient times. It is even the opinion of many perſons of the beſt judgment, that the convention entered into by the late duke of Cumberland, was by no means ſtrictly obſerved by the court of London.

When I conſider this, ſir, I confeſs I look upon the expreſſion in general Burgoyne's letter to general Gates, of November 14, as of the moſt alarming nature. For no other or better reaſon, even ſo much as pretended, than that his quarters were not ſo commodious as he expected, he declares *the public faith is broke, and we are the immediate ſufferers.* In this he expreſsly declares and ſubſcribes his opinion, that the convention is broken on our part; and in the laſt expreſſion, we are the *immediate* ſufferers, every perſon muſt perceive a menacing intimation of who ſhall be the ſufferers when he ſhall have it in his power.

Being ſufficiently ſettled as to the principle on which I ſhall found my opinion, it is unneceſſary for me to give an account of the law of nature and nations, or to heap up citations from the numerous writers on that ſubject. But that what I ſhall ſay may have the greater force, I beg it may be obſerved, that the law of nature and nations is nothing elſe but the law of general reaſon, or thoſe obligations of duty from reaſon and conſcience, on one individual to another antecedent to any particular law derived from the ſocial compact, or even actual conſent. On this account, it is called the law of nature ; and becauſe there are very rarely to be found any parties in ſuch a free ſtate with regard to each other, except independent nations, therefore it is alſo called the law of nations. One nation to another is juſt as man to man in a ſtate of nature. Keeping this in view, a perſon of integrity will paſs as ſound a judgment on ſubjects of this kind, by conſulting his own heart, as by turning over books and ſyſtems. The chief uſe of books and ſyſtems, is to apply the principal to particular caſes and ſuppoſitions differently claſſed, and to point out the practice of nations in

ſeveral minute and ſpecial particulars, which unleſs aſcertained by practice, would be very uncertain and ambiguous.

But, ſir, I muſt beg your attention, and that of the houſe, to the nature of the caſe before us—at leaſt as I think it ought to be ſtated. I am afraid that ſome members may be miſled, by conſidering this declaration of general Burgoyne as an irregularity of the ſame ſpecies, if I may ſpeak ſo, with the other indiſcretions or even frauds, if you pleaſe to call them ſo, of withholding the cartouch boxes, or hiding or ſtealing the bayonets. The queſtion is not, whether this or the other thing done by the army is a breach of the convention. I have for my part given up all theſe particulars, and declared my willingneſs to ratify the convention, after I have heard them and believe them to be true. But we have here the declared opinion of one of the parties, that the public faith is broken by the other. Now, the ſimpleſt man in the world knows, that a mutual onerous contract is always conditional; and that if the condition fails on one ſide, whether from neceſſity or fraud, the other is free. Therefore we have reaſon to conclude, that if Mr. Burgoyne is of opinion that the convention is broken on our part, he will not hold to it on his. He would act the part of a fool if he did. It is of no conſequence to ſay his opinion is ill-founded or unjuſt, as it manifeſtly is in the preſent caſe; for whether it is juſt or unjuſt, if it is *really* his opinion (and we ſhould wrong his ſincerity to doubt it) the conſequences are the ſame with reſpect to us, Men do often, perhaps generally, adhere with greater obſtinacy to opinions that are ill, than thoſe that are well founded, and avenge imaginary or trifling injuries with greater violence than thoſe that are real and great. Nay, we may draw an argument for our danger from the very injuſtice of his complaint. If he has conceived the convention to be broken on ſo frivolous a pretence as that his lodging is not quite commodious, after the juſt caution inſerted by general Gates in the preliminary articles, what have we to expect from him as ſoon as he ſhall recover his liberty, and the power of doing miſchief? It ſhews a diſ-

poſition to find fault, and an impatience under his preſent confinement, the future effects of which we have the greateſt reaſon to dread.

The more I conſider this matter, ſir, the more it ſtrikes me with its force. General Gates ſays upon the ſubject of accommodation, *granted as far as circumſtances will admit.* Was not this proper and neceſſary? It was very natural to ſuppoſe that general Burgoyne, accuſtomed to the ſplendor of the Britiſh court, and poſſeſſed with ideas of his own importance, would be but ill pleaſed with the beſt accommodations that could be obtained for him, and his numerous followers, in one of the frugal ſtates of New-England. It was alſo in the neighbourhood of a place not in the leaſt expecting the honor of ſuch gueſts, which had been long the ſeat of war—which had been exhauſted by our army, and plundered by their's. One would have thought that the recollection of the ruin of Charleſtown, the burning of which, if I miſtake not, in a letter of his from Boſton to England, he calls a glorious light, might have prevented his complaints, even though he had leſs elbow room than he wiſhed for. But as circumſtances ſtand, by what conduct ſhall we be able to ſatisfy him? When will pretences ever be wanting to one ſeeking to prove the convention broken, when it is his inclination or his intereſt to do ſo.

It has been ſaid, ſir, that we ought not to take this declaration of his in ſo ſerious a manner; that it was written raſhly, and in the heat of paſſion; and that he did not mean that we ſhould dread ſuch conſequences from it. All this I believe to be ſtrictly true. It probably fell from him in paſſion—and very unadviſedly. But is he the firſt perſon that has raſhly betrayed his own miſchievous deſigns? Or is this a reaſon for our not availing ourſelves of the happy diſcovery? His folly in this inſtance is our good fortune. He is a man, ſir, whom I never ſaw, though I have been more than once in England; but if I ſhould ſay I did not know him, after having read his lofty and ſonorous proclamation, and ſome other productions, I ſhould ſay what was not true. He is evidently a man ſhowy, vain, impetuous and raſh. It is reported of gene-

ral Gates, from whom I never heard that any other words of boaſting or oſtentation fell, that he ſaid he knew Burgoyne, and that he could build a wall for him to run his head againſt. I do not by any means approve of boaſting in general. I think a man ſhould not boaſt of what he has done, much leſs of what he only means to do; yet I cannot help ſaying, that this was a moſt accurate prediction, which, with the event that followed it, plainly points out to us the character of general Burgoyne. Do you think that ſuch a man would not take the advantage of this pretended breach of the convention on our part; and endeavor to wipe off the reproach of his late ignominious ſurrender by ſome ſignal or deſperate undertaking? —

— — — — — —

SPEECH IN CONGRESS,

ON A

MOTION FOR PAYING

THE INTEREST OF

LOAN-OFFICE CERTIFICATES.

Mr. PRESIDENT,

I MUST entreat the attention of the houſe, while I endeavor to ſtate this ſubject with as much brevity and perſpicuity as I am maſter of. It is not eaſy to forbear mentioning, yet I ſhall but barely mention, the diſtreſſed and unhappy ſituation of many of the perſons concerned in the public loans. I ſhall alſo paſs by their characters, as whigs and friends to the American cauſe. I ſhall paſs by the ſervices which many of them have rendered, in their perſons, by their friends, by their purſes, and by their prayers. Theſe are affecting conſiderations, which ought not, and which I am confident will not fail, to have their weight with every member of this houſe. Let us then, leave theſe topics altogether, and let us confine ourſelves to the duty and intereſt of the United States in their preſent ſituation, when the care of their affairs is committed to us who are here aſſembled.

Public credit is of the utmoſt moment to a ſtate which expects to ſupport itſelf, at any time; but it is all in all in a time of war. The want of it defeats the wiſeſt mea-

ſures, and renders every department torpid and motionleſs. It cannot be denied, that by many unhappy, if not unwiſe meaſures, public credit among us has been reduced to the loweſt ebb, firſt by a monſtrous and unheard of emiſſion of paper money; next by an act of bankruptcy, reducing it to ſix-pence in the pound; then by a table of depreciation. There remained but one thing which preſerved us ſome degree of reſpectability, that the promiſes made to lenders of money before a certain period, had been kept for three years; but now, as the laſt and finiſhing ſtroke, this alſo is broken to pieces, and given to the winds.

Let not gentlemen cry out as before, why diſtinguiſh theſe people from other public creditors? I do not diſtinguiſh them by aſking payment for them alone; but I diſtinguiſh them, becauſe their circumſtances and diſappointment give a new and diſgraceful ſtroke to the credit of the United States. I diſtinguiſh them, becauſe I hope that their ſufferings and complaints may induce us to take ſome ſtep towards the payment of all. Strange it is to the laſt degree, that this compariſon ſhould ſeem to ſet gentlemen's minds at eaſe—becauſe great injury has been done to one claſs, therefore the ſame may and ought to be done to another. In this way it would be very eaſy to rid ourſelves of both, and to ſay, why all this noiſe about loan-office certificates? have not all the receivers of continental bills ſuffered as much or more than they, and had the immenſe ſum of two hundred millions ſunk in their hands?—If this would be a good anſwer in one caſe, it certainly would in the other. Now is it proper or ſafe in our preſent ſituation, to refuſe all kind of payment to the public creditors in this country, ſo numerous and ſo variouſly circumſtanced? Let us examine it a little.

We are now endeavoring to borrow, and have the hope of borrowing money in Europe. Is this the way to ſucceed? Is it not poſſible, is it not highly probable, that our treatment of our creditors here, will ſoon be known there? Nay, are not ſome of our creditors intereſted in this very meaſure, reſiding there? Muſt not this repeated inſolvency, neglect and even contempt of public creditors, pre-

vent people from lending us in Europe? I am ſorry to ſay it, but in truth I do believe that it is their ignorance of our ſituation and paſt conduct, that alone will make them truſt us. I confeſs, that if I were at Amſterdam juſt now, and had plenty of money, I would give what I thought proper to the United States, but would lend them none.

It is to be hoped, that in time truth and juſtice will ſo far prevail, that our poſterity will ſee the neceſſity of doing their duty; but at preſent we ſeem but little diſpoſed to it.—By making ſome payment to the public creditors immediately, and proſecuting the meaſures already begun for further ſecurity, we ſhould obtain a dignity and weight abroad, that would procure money wherever it could be found.

Let us next conſider the effect upon our credit at home. It has ever been my opinion, that if our ſecurity were good, and our credit entire, ſo that obligations by the public would be turned into money at any time, at par or at little leſs, we ſhould find no inconſiderable number of lenders. Every thing of this kind proceeds upon ſuch certain principles as never to fail in any inſtance of having their effect. From the general diſpoſition that prevails in this new country, real eſtate is leſs eſteemed, and money at intereſt more, that is to ſay comparatively ſpeaking, than in the old. Now, whatever ſucceſs we may have in Europe, I am perſuaded we ſhould ſtill need, or at leaſt be much the better of loans at home, which are in their nature preferable to thoſe abroad; and therefore whatever leads utterly to deſtroy our credit at home, does an eſſential injury to the public cauſe. Nay, though there were not any proper loans to be expected or attempted at home, ſome truſting to public credit would be neceſſary, to make thoſe to whom we are already indebted patient, or at leaſt ſilent for ſome time. To this may be added that annihilating public credit, or rather rendering it contemptible, has an unhappy influence upon every particular internal temporary operation. People will not ſeek your ſervice, but fly from it. Hence it is well known, that ſometimes ſtores and ammunition or other neceſſaries for the

army, have ſtood ſtill upon the road till they were half loſt for want of ready money, or people who would truſt you, to carry them forward.

We muſt now go a little further, and ſay that if this propoſition is inforced, it will be a great hindrance to the payment of taxes, and raiſing the ſupplies which muſt be called for from the ſtates. I do not inſiſt upon what has been already mentioned, that the payment propoſed would enable many to pay their taxes; becauſe, though that is certainly true with reſpect to thoſe who ſhall receive it, and though it is admitted they are pretty numerous, yet in my opinion it is but a trifle to the other effects of it, both in the poſitive and negative way. It would give dignity to the public ſpirit, and animation to the people in general. It would give the people better thoughts of their rulers, and prevent murmuring at public perſons and public meaſures. I need not tell this houſe how much depends in a free ſtate, upon having the eſteem and attachment of the people. It is but a very general view that people at a diſtance can take of the management of men in public truſt; but in general it is well known, they are abundantly jealous, and as ready to believe evil as good. I do not ſpeak by gueſs, but from facts, when I tell you that they ſay, we are now paying prodigious taxes, but what becomes of all the money? The army, ſay they, get none of it, being almoſt two years in arrear. The public creditors ſay they get none of it, not even intereſt for their money. This was told me by the county collector of Somerſet county, New-Jerſey, who was not a contentious man, but wiſhed to know what he ought to ſay to the people. Now this ſmall payment, as it would be very general, would be much talked of; and I am perſuaded, for its general good influence, would be worth all, and more than all the ſum we ſhall beſtow. I have heard it ſaid, in ſome ſimilar caſes, you muſt ſometimes throw a little water into a pump, in order to bring a great deal out of it.

Now, on the other hand, what will be the conſequence of a total refuſal? You have told the public creditors, that you have no money in Europe to draw for. They

will very ſpeedily hear of this loan in Holland. They are ſufficiently exaſperated already; this will add to their indignation. They really are already ſore; their minds will be rankled more than ever. They are looking with an evil eye upon ſome new men coming into play, and thinking themſelves unjuſtly and ungratefully uſed. I believe they are not ſo much without principle, as to turn their backs upon the public cauſe; but a ſpirit of faction and general diſcontent, upon ſuch plauſible grounds, may do it eſſential injury. They may combine to refuſe their taxes; and if any ſuch unhappy aſſociation ſhould be formed, it would ſpread; and many from a blind attachment to their own intereſt, would pretend to be upon the ſame footing, though they have no concern in the matter: and if this diſpoſition ſhould become general, it would put an entire ſtop to all our proceedings. This diſcouraging proſpect is not merely founded on conjecture. I have been told that there have already been meetings for entering into concert for refuſing to pay taxes. Is it poſſible we can, in our circumſtances, more profitably employ the ſum mentioned in the motion, than in giving ſatisfaction to a deſerving body of men, and in preventing evils of ſo alarming a nature.

It is poſſible, ſir, that ſome are comforting themſelves with their own ſincerity and good intentions; that they ultimately reſolve to pay all honorably; that they have taken, and are taking meaſures to prepare for it.—A ſum of money is called for on purpoſe to pay the intereſt of the public debts; and the five per cent. impoſt is appropriated to the ſame purpoſe. But, ſir, it will take a conſiderable time before the moſt ſpeedy of theſe meaſures can bring money into the treaſury; and in the mean time the late ſtep of refuſing to draw bills, has given ſuch a ſtroke to loan-office certificates, that their value is fallen to a very trifle—the ſpirits of the people are broken—a gentleman told me the other day, I ſee the loan-office certificates are gone, as well as all the reſt of the money. The inevitable conſequence will be, that hard and irreſiſtible neceſſity, or incredulity and ill humor, will make them part with them for a mere nothing; and then the greateſt part of

them by far will really be in the hands of ſpeculators. When this is notoriouſly the caſe, I ſhall not be at all ſurpriſed to find that ſomebody will propoſe a new ſcale of depreciation, and ſay to the holders, you ſhall have them for what they were worth and generally ſold at, at ſuch a time. Paſt experience juſtifies this expectation, and no declaration we can make to the contrary, will be ſtronger than that of Congreſs in the year 1779, that they would redeem the money, and that it was a vile and ſlanderous aſſertion, that they would ſuffer it to ſink in people's hands. I know particular perſons alſo, who by believing this declaration, loſt their all. Now, if this ſhall be the caſe again, public faith will be once more trodden under foot; and the few remaining original holders of certificates will loſe them entirely, being taken in connexion with thoſe who purchaſed them at an under value.

PART OF A

SPEECH IN CONGRESS,

ON THE

FINANCES.

Mr. PRESIDENT,

I HAVE little to ſay againſt the reſolutions, as they ſtand reported by the ſuperintendant of finance. Perhaps they are unavoidable in the circumſtances to which we are reduced. Yet the ſtep ſeems to be ſo very important, and the conſequences of it ſo much to be dreaded, that I muſt intreat the patience of the houſe, till I ſtate the danger in a few words, and examine whether any thing can poſſibly be added to it, which may in ſome degree prevent the evils which we apprehend, or at leaſt exculpate Congreſs, and convince the public that it is the effect of abſolute neceſſity.

Sir, if we enter into theſe reſolves as they ſtand, it will be a deliberate deviation from an expreſs and abſolute ſtipulation, and therefore it will, as it was expreſſed by an honorable gentleman the other day, give the laſt ſtab to public credit. It will be in vain, in future, to aſk the public to believe any promiſe we ſhall make, even when the moſt clear and explicit grounds of confidence are produced. Perhaps it will be ſaid that public credit is already gone; and it hath been ſaid that there is no more in this, than

in neglecting to pay the intereſt of the loan-office certificates of later date; but though there were no other differences between them, this being another and freſher inſtance of the ſame, will have an additional evil influence upon public credit. But in fact, there is ſomething more in it than in the other. The ſolemn ſtipulation of Congreſs, ſpecifying the manner in which the intereſt was to be paid, was conſidered as an additional ſecurity, and gave a value to theſe certificates, which the others never had. I beg that no gentleman may think that I hold it a light matter to withhold the intereſt from the other lenders; they will be convinced I hope, of the contrary before I have done; but I have made the compariſon merely to ſhew what will be the influence of this meaſure upon the public mind, and therefore upon the credit and eſtimation of Congreſs. Now it is plain, that the particular promiſe of giving bills upon Europe, as it had an effect, and was intended to have it in procuring credit, it muſt, when broken or withdrawn, operate in the moſt powerful manner to our prejudice. I will give an example of this, in our melancholy paſt experience. The old continental money was diſgraced and ſunk, firſt by the act of March 18th, 1780, (which the Duke de Vergennes juſtly called an act of bankruptcy,) telling you would pay no more of your debt than ſix-pence in the pound. This was afterwards further improved by new eſtimates of depreciation, of ſeventy-five and one hundred and fifty, for new ſtate paper, which itſelf was ſunk to two or three for one; and yet bad as theſe men's caſes were, the diſgrace ariſing from them was more than doubled, by people's referring to, and repeating a public declaration of Congreſs, in which we complained of the injurious ſlanders of thoſe that ſaid we would ſuffer the money to ſink in the hands of the holders, and making the moſt ſolemn proteſtations, that ultimately the money ſhould be redeemed dollar for dollar; and to my knowledge, ſome truſting to that very declaration, ſold their eſtates at what they thought a high price, and brought themſelves to utter ruin.

I cannot help requeſting Congreſs to attend to the ſtate of thoſe perſons who held the Loan Office certificates

which drew intereſt on France; they are all, without exception, the firmeſt and ſafeſt friends to the cauſe of America; they were in general the moſt firm, and active, and generous friends. Many of them advanced large ſums of hard money, to aſſiſt you in carrying on the war in Canada. None of them at all put away even the loan-office certificates on ſpeculation, but either from a generous intention of ſerving the public, or from an entire confidence in the public credit. There is one circumſtance which ought to be attended to, viz. the promiſe of intereſt—bills on Europe were not made till the 10th of September, 1777. It was ſaid a day or two ago, that thoſe who ſent in caſh a little before March 1ſt, 1778, had by the depreciated ſtate of the money, received almoſt their principal; but this makes but a ſmall part of the money, for there were but ſix months for the people to put in the money, after the promiſe was made; only the moſt apparent juſtice obliged Congreſs to extend the privilege to thoſe who had put in their money before. Beſides, nothing can be more unequal and injurious than reckoning the money by the depreciation, either before or after the 1ſt of March, 1778, for a great part of the money in all the Loan offices was ſuch as had been paid up in its nominal value, in conſequence of the Tender laws.

This points you, Sir, to another claſs of people, from whom money was taken, viz. widows and orphans, corporations and public bodies. How many guardians were actually led, or indeed were obliged, to put their depreciated and depreciating money into the funds—I ſpeak from good knowledge. The truſtees of the college of New-Jerſey, in June, 1777, directed a committee of their's to put all the money that ſhould be paid up to them, in the loan-office, ſo that they have now nearly inveſted all. Some put in before March, 1778, and a greater part ſubſequent to that date. Now it muſt be known to every body, that ſince the payment of the intereſt bills gave a value to theſe early loans, many have continued their intereſt in them, and reſted in a manner wholly on them for ſupport. Had they entertained the ſlighteſt ſuſpicion that they would be cut off, they could have ſold them for ſomething, and

applied themſelves to other means of ſubſiſtence; but as the caſe now ſtands, you are reducing not an inconſiderable number of your very beſt friends to abſolute beggary. During the whole period, and through the whole ſyſtem of continental money, your friends have ſuffered alone—the diſaffected and lukewarm have always evaded the burden—have in many inſtances turned the ſufferings of the country to their own account—have triumphed over the whigs—and if the whole ſhall be crowned with this laſt ſtroke, it ſeems but reaſonable that they ſhould treat us with inſult and deriſion. And what faith do you expect the public creditors ſhould place in your promiſe of ever paying them at all? What reaſon, after what is paſt, have they to dread that you will divert the fund which is now mentioned as a diſtant ſource of payment? If a future Congreſs ſhould do this, it would not be one whit worſe than what has been already done.

I wiſh, Sir, this houſe would weigh a little, the public conſequences that will immediately follow this reſolution. The grief, diſappointment and ſufferings of your beſt friends, has been already mentioned—then prepare yourſelves to hear from your enemies the moſt inſulting abuſe. You will be accuſed of the moſt oppreſſive tyranny, and the groſſeſt fraud. If it be poſſible to poiſon the minds of the public, by making this body ridiculous or contemptible, they will have the faireſt opportunity of doing ſo, that ever was put in their hands. But I muſt return to our plundered, long ruined friends; we cannot ſay to what their rage and diſappointment may bring them; we know that nothing on earth is ſo deeply reſentful, as deſpiſed or rejected love—whether they may proceed to any violent or diſorderly meaſures, it is impoſſible to know. We have an old proverb, That the eyes will break through ſtone walls, and for my own part, I ſhould very much dread the furious and violent efforts of deſpair. Would to God, that the independence of America was once eſtabliſhed by a treaty of peace in Europe; for we know that in all great and fierce political contentions, the effect of power and circumſtances

is very great ; and that if the tide has run long with great violence one way, if it does not fully reach its purpoſe, and is by any means brought to a ſtand, it is apt to take a direction, and return with the ſame or greater violence than it advanced. Muſt this be riſked at a criſis when the people begin to be fatigued with the war, to feel the heavy expence of it, by paying taxes ; and when the enemy, convinced of their folly in their former ſeverities, are doing every thing they can to ingratiate themſelves with the public at large. But though our friends ſhould not be induced to take violent and ſeditious meaſures all at once, I am almoſt certain it will produce a particular hatred and contempt of Congreſs, the repreſentative body of the union, and ſtill a greater hatred of the individuals who compoſe the body at this time. One thing will undoubtedly happen ; that it will greatly abate the reſpect which is due from the public to this body, and therefore weaken their authority in all other parts of their proceedings.

I beg leave to ſay, Sir, that in all probability it will lay the foundation for other greater and more ſcandalous ſteps of the ſame kind. You will ſay what greater can there be ? Look back a little to your hiſtory. The firſt great and deliberate breach of public faith, was the act of March 18th, 1780, reducing the money to forty for one, which was declaring you would pay your debt at ſix-pence in the pound —But did it not turn ? No, by and by it was ſet in this ſtate and others at ſeventy-five, and finally ſet one hundred and fifty for one, in new paper, in ſtate paper, which in ſix months, roſe to four for one. Now, Sir, what will be the caſe with theſe certificates ? Before this propoſal was known, their fixed price was about half a crown for a dollar of the eſtimated depreciated value ; when this reſolution is fairly fixed, they will immediately fall in value, perhaps to a ſhilling the dollar, probably leſs. Multitudes of people in deſpair, and abſolute neceſſity, will ſell them for next to nothing, and when the holders come at laſt to apply for their money, I think it highly probable, you will give them a ſcale of depreciation, and tell them, they coſt ſo little that it would be an injury to the public to pay the full value. And in truth, Sir, ſuppoſing you

finally to pay the full value of the certificates to the holders, the original and moſt meritorious proprietors will in many, perhaps in moſt caſes, loſe the whole.

It will be very proper to conſider what effect this will have upon foreign nations; certainly it will ſet us in a moſt contemptible light. We are juſt beginning to appear among the powers of the earth, and it may be ſaid of national, as of private characters, they ſoon begin to form, and when diſadvantageous ideas are formed, they are not eaſily altered or deſtroyed. In the very inſtance before us, many of theſe certificates are poſſeſſed by the ſubjects of foreign princes, and indeed are in foreign parts. We muſt not think that other ſovereigns will ſuffer their ſubjects to be plundered in ſo wanton and extravagant a manner. You have on your files, letters from the Count de Vergennes, on the ſubject of your former depreciation; in which he tells you, that whatever liberty you take with your own ſubjects, you muſt not think of treating the ſubjects of France in the ſame way; and it is not impoſſible that you may hear upon this ſubject, what you little expect, when the terms of peace are to be ſettled. I do not in the leaſt doubt that it may be demanded that you ſhould pay to the full of its nominal value, all the money as well as loan-office certificates, which ſhall be found in the hands of the ſubjects of France, Spain or Holland, and it would be perfectly juſt. I have mentioned France, &c. but it is not only not impoſſible, but highly probable, that by accident or danger, or both, many of theſe loan-office certificates may be in the hands of Engliſh ſubjects. Do you think they will not demand payment? Do you think they will make any difference between their being before or after March 1ſt, 1778? And will you preſent them with a ſcale of depreciation? Remember the affair of the Canada bills, in the laſt peace between England and France—I wiſh we could take example from our enemies. How many fine diſſertations have we upon the merit of national truth and honor in Great-Britain. Can we think without bluſhing, upon our contrary conduct in the matter of finance? By their punctuality in fulfilling their engagements as to intereſt, they have been able to ſupport

a load of debt altogether enormous. Be pleaſed to obſerve, Sir, that they are not wholly without experience of depreciation: navy debentures and ſailors' tickets have been frequently ſold at an half, and ſometimes even at a third of their value; by that means they ſeem to be held by that claſs of men called by us ſpeculators. Did that government ever think of preſenting the holders of them, when they came to be paid, with a ſcale of depreciation? The very idea of it would knock the whole ſyſtem of public credit to pieces.

But the importance of this matter will be felt before the end of the war. We are at this time earneſtly ſoliciting foreign loans. With what face can we expect to have credit in foreign parts, and in future loans, after we have ſo notoriouſly broken every engagement which we have hitherto made? A diſpoſition to pay, and viſible probable means of payment, are abſolutely neceſſary to credit; and where that is once eſtabliſhed, it is not difficult to borrow. If it may be a mean of turning the attention of Congreſs to this ſubject, I beg of them to obſerve, that if they could but lay down a foundation of credit, they would get money enough to borrow in this country, where we are. There is property enough here; and, comparatively ſpeaking, there is a greater number of perſons here who would prefer money at intereſt to purchaſing and holding real eſtates. The ideas of all old country people are high in favor of real eſtate. Though the intereſt of money, even upon the very beſt ſecurity there, is from four to four and a half, four and three quarters and five per centum; yet when any real eſtate is to be ſold, there will be ten purchaſers where one only can obtain it, and it will coſt ſo much as not to bring more than two, two and a half, and at moſt three per centum.

It is quite otherwiſe in this country, and indeed it ought to be otherwiſe. To purchaſe an eſtate in the cultivated parts of the country, except what a man poſſeſſes himſelf, will not be near ſo profitable as the intereſt of money; and in many caſes where it is rented out, it is ſo waſted and worn by the tenant, that it would be a greater profit at the end of ſeven years, that the land had been left to it.

ſelf, to bear woods and buſhes that ſhould rot upon the ground, without any rent at all. Any body alſo may ſee, that it is almoſt univerſal in this country, when a man dies leaving infant children, that the executors ſell all his property to turn it into money, and put it in ſecurities for eaſy and equal diviſion.

All theſe things, Mr. Preſident, proceed upon certain and indubitable principles, which never fail of their effect. Therefore, you have only to make your payments as ſoon, as regular, and as profitable as other borrowers, and you will get all the money you want; and by a ſmall advantage over others, it will be poured in upon you, ſo that you ſhall not need to go to the lenders, for they will come to you.

PART OF A

SPEECH IN CONGRESS,

UPON THE

CONFEDERATION.

THE abſolute neceſſity of union to the vigor and ſucceſs of thoſe meaſures on which we are already entered, is felt and confeſſed by every one of us, without exception; ſo far, indeed, that thoſe who have expreſſed their fears or ſuſpicions of the exiſting confederacy proving abortive, have yet agreed in ſaying that there muſt and ſhall be a confederacy for the purpoſes of, and till the finiſhing of this war. So far is well; and ſo far it is pleaſing to hear them expreſs their ſentiments. But I intreat gentlemen calmly to conſider how far the giving up all hopes of a laſting confederacy among theſe ſtates, for their future ſecurity and improvement, will have an effect upon the ſtability and efficacy of even the temporary confederacy, which all acknowledge to be neceſſary? I am fully perſuaded, that when it ceaſes to be generally known, that the delegates of the provinces conſider a laſting union as impracticable, it will greatly derange the minds of the people, and weaken their hands in defence of their country, which they have now undertaken with ſo much alacrity and ſpirit. I confeſs it would to me greatly diminiſh the glory and importance of the ſtruggle,

whether conſidered as for the rights of mankind in general, or for the proſperity and happineſs of this continent in future times.

It would quite depreciate the object of hope, as well as place it at a greater diſtance. For what would it ſignify to riſk our poſſeſſions and ſhed our blood to ſet ourſelves free from the encroachments and oppreſſion of Great-Britain—with a certainty, as ſoon as peace was ſettled with them of a more laſting war, a more unnatural, more bloody, and much more hopeleſs war, among the colonies themſelves?—Some of us conſider ourſelves as acting for poſterity at preſent, having little expectation of living to ſee all things fully ſettled, and the good conſequences of liberty taking effect. But how much more uncertain the hope of ſeeing the internal conteſts of the colonies ſettled upon a laſting and equitable footing?

One of the greateſt dangers I have always conſidered the colonies as expoſed to at preſent, is treachery among themſelves, augmented by bribery and corruption from our enemies. But what force would be added to the arguments of ſeducers, if they could ſay with truth, that it was of no conſequence whether we ſucceeded againſt Great-Britain, or not; for we muſt, in the end, be ſubjected, the greateſt part of us, to the power of one or more of the ſtrongeſt or largeſt of the American ſtates? And here I would apply the argument which we have ſo often uſed againſt Great-Britain—that in all hiſtory we ſee that the ſlaves of freemen, and the ſubject ſtates of republics, have been of all others the moſt grievouſly oppreſſed. I do not think the records of time can produce an inſtance of ſlaves treated with ſo much barbarity as the Helotes by the Lacedemonians, who were the moſt illuſtrious champions for liberty in all Greece; or of provinces more plundered and ſpoiled than the ſtates conquered by the Romans, for one hundred years before Cæſar's dictatorſhip. The reaſon is plain: there are many great men in free ſtates. There were many conſular gentlemen in that great republic, who all conſidered themſelves as greater than kings, and muſt have kingly fortunes, which they had no other way of

acquiring but by governments of provinces, which laſted generally but one year, and ſeldom more than two.

In what I have already ſaid, or may ſay, or any caſes I may ſtate, I hope every gentleman will do me the juſtice to believe that I have not the moſt diſtant view to particular perſons or ſocieties, and mean only to reaſon from the uſual courſe of things, and the prejudices inſeparable from men as ſuch. And can we help ſaying, that there will be a much greater degree, not only of the corruption of particular perſons, but the defection of particular provinces from the preſent confederacy, if they conſider our ſucceſs itſelf as only a prelude to conteſt of a more dreadful nature, and indeed much more properly a civil war than that which now often obtains the name? Muſt not ſmall colonies in particular be in danger of ſaying, we muſt ſecure ourſelves? If the colonies are independent ſtates, ſeparate and diſunited, after this war, we may be ſure of coming off by the worſe. We are in no condition to contend with ſeveral of them. Our trade in general, and our trade with them, muſt be upon ſuch terms as they ſhall be pleaſed to preſcribe.—What will be the conſequence of this? Will they not be ready to prefer putting themſelves under the protection of Great-Britain, France or Holland, rather than ſubmit to the tyranny of their neighbors, who were lately their equals? Nor would it be at all impoſſible, that they ſhould enter into ſuch raſh engagements as would prove their own deſtruction, from a mixture of apprehended neceſſity and real reſentment.

Perhaps it may be thought that breaking off this confederacy, and leaving it unfiniſhed after we have entered upon it, will be only poſtponing the duty to ſome future period? Alas, nothing can exceed the abſurdity of that ſuppoſition. Does not all hiſtory cry out, that a common danger is the great and only effectual means of ſettling difficulties, and compoſing differences. Have we not experienced its efficacy in producing ſuch a degree of union through theſe colonies, as nobody would have propheſied, and hardly any would have expected?

If therefore, at preſent, when the danger is yet imminent, when it is ſo far from being over, that it is but

coming to its height, we ſhall find it impoſſible to agree upon the terms of this confederacy, what madneſs is it to ſuppoſe that there ever will be a time, or that circumſtances will ſo change, as to make it even probable, that it will be done at an after ſeaſon? Will not the very ſame difficulties that are in our way, be in the way of thoſe who ſhall come after us? Is it poſſible that they ſhould be ignorant of them, or inattentive to them? Will they not have the ſame jealouſies of each other, the ſame attachment to local prejudices, and particular intereſt? So certain is this, that I look upon it as on the repentance of a ſinner—Every day's delay, though it adds to the neceſſity, yet augments the difficulty, and takes from the inclination.

There is one thing that has been thrown out, by which ſome ſeem to perſuade themſelves of, and others to be more indifferent about the ſucceſs of a confederacy—that from the nature of men, it is to be expected that a time muſt come when it will be diſſolved and broken in pieces. I am none of thoſe who either deny or conceal the depravity of human nature, till it is purified by the light of truth, and renewed by the Spirit of the living God. Yet I apprehend there is no force in that reaſoning at all. Shall we eſtabliſh nothing good, becauſe we know it cannot be eternal? Shall we live without government, becauſe every conſtitution has its old age, and its period? Becauſe we know that we ſhall die, ſhall we take no pains to preſerve or lengthen out life? Far from it, ſir: it only requires the more watchful attention, to ſettle government upon the beſt principles, and in the wiſeſt manner, that it may laſt as long as the nature of things will admit.

But I beg leave to ſay ſomething more, though with ſome riſk that it will be thought viſionary and romantic. I do expect, Mr. Preſident, a progreſs, as in every other human art, ſo in the order and perfection of human ſociety, greater than we have yet ſeen: and why ſhould we be wanting to ourſelves in urging it forward. It is certain, I think, that human ſcience and religion have kept company together, and greatly aſſiſted each other's

progreſs in the world. I do not ſay that intellectual and moral qualities are in the ſame proportion in particular perſons; but they have a great and friendly influence upon one another, in ſocieties and larger bodies.

There have been great improvements, not only in human knowledge, but in human nature; the progreſs of which can be eaſily traced in hiſtory. Every body is able to look back to the time in Europe, when the liberal ſentiments that now prevail upon the rights of conſcience, would have been looked upon as abſurd. It is but little above two hundred years ſince that enlarged ſyſtem called the balance of power, took place: and I maintain, that it is a greater ſtep from the former diſunited and hoſtile ſituation of kingdoms and ſtates, to their preſent condition, than it would be from their preſent condition to a ſtate of more perfect and laſting union. It is not impoſſible, that in future times all the ſtates on one quarter of the globe, may ſee it proper by ſome plan of union, to perpetuate ſecurity and peace: and ſure I am, a well planned confederacy among the ſtates of America, may hand down the bleſſings of peace and public order to many generations. The union of the ſeven provinces of the Low Countries, has never yet been broken; and they are of very different degrees of ſtrength and wealth. Neither have the Cantons of Switzerland ever broken among themſelves, though there are ſome of them proteſtants, and ſome of them papiſts, by public eſtabliſhment. Not only ſo, but theſe confederacies are ſeldom engaged in a war with other nations. Wars are generally between monarchs, or ſingle ſtates that are large. A confederation of itſelf keeps war at a diſtance from the bodies of which it is compoſed.

For all theſe reaſons, ſir, I humbly apprehend that every argument from honor, intereſt, ſafety and neceſſity, conſpire in preſſing us to a confederacy; and if it be ſeriouſly attempted, I hope, by the bleſſing of God upon our endeavors, it will be happily accompliſhed. — —

— — — — — —

SPEECH IN CONGRESS,

ON THE APPOINTMENT OF

PLENIPOTENTIARIES.

Mr. PRESIDENT,

I AM ſorry to obſerve, that after going through the inſtructions to be given to our plenipotentiary or plenipotentiaries, we ſhould have ſo warm a debate, and indeed ſeem to be ſo equally divided upon the queſtion, whether there ſhould be one or more, to whom we will entruſt the negociation.

As to the practice of European nations, I believe it is ſo various as not to afford any argument on one ſide or the other: we may appoint one or more—there will be nothing ſingular or remarkable in it, ſo as to make our conduct look like ignorance in ſuch matters. I am inclined to think, however, that negociations are generally conducted near to their concluſion, by one confidential perſon, though after the more important preliminaries are ſettled, more may be ſometimes appointed, to give greater ſolemnity to the concluſion. We are therefore at liberty to determine ourſelves wholly by the general reaſon and nature of the thing, and our own particular circumſtances.

As to the firſt of theſe, on the ſide of one perſon, it may be ſaid, there will be more preciſion, more expedition, more uniformity, and more certainty of agreement with others and conſiſtency with himſelf. And the perſon whom

we have employed, is a man of ſound and clear underſtanding, and has had the advantage of being a long time in Europe, and no doubt has been turning his thoughts, and making enquiries, upon the ſubject ever ſince he went there; ſo that we may ſuppoſe him pretty ripely adviſed.

On the other ſide, it may be ſaid, that, if alone, he might be at a loſs; and that it would be of advantage to him to have the advice of others. It is even ſaid, that there is a neceſſity of others better acquainted with parts of the country different from thoſe with which he has been chiefly connected.—As to council, that does not ſtrike me much—perhaps there is greater ſafety in one than three; becauſe he is fully reſponſible; whereas if a common council is taken, the blame is divided, and every one is leſs difficulted to juſtify his conduct in the iſſue. Beſides, is there no danger to the cauſe itſelf, from an obſtinate diviſion of ſentiments in thoſe who are entruſted with the conduct of it? This would expoſe us, in the opinion of thoſe who obſerved it, and might perhaps give leſs reſpect to what each or all of them might ſay or do.

As to the neceſſity of perſons from different parts of the country, it is not eaſy to conceive what circumſtances, in a negociation of this kind, can be peculiar to one part of the country more than another. If it were to make rules for the internal government, taxation, or commerce of the ſtates, there would be ſome force in the remark; but when it is only to make peace for the liberty and protection of all, there ſeems to be little weight in it.

But now let us conſider our particular circumſtances. Mention has been made of the difference between Mr. Adams and the count de Vergennes. I have given particular attention to all that was ſaid in his letter upon that ſubject, and all that has been ſaid by the miniſter of France here; and there was not one hint given that could lead us to think it was their deſire or expectation that he ſhould be diſmiſſed or ſuperſeded, or even bridled by the addition of others in the commiſſion. We have fully complied with their deſire upon this ſubject, in the inſtructions. There is the greateſt reaſon to think that they are well ſatisfied upon it. But if we ſhould ſtill go further,

and either diſcharge him, or do what is in ſubſtance the ſame, or might be ſuppoſed or conceived by him to be the ſame, this would be rather an act of too great obſequiouſneſs, and but an ill example for the future conduct of our affairs. What we do now, will be often mentioned in after times; and if the like practice prevail, it will diſcourage public ſervants from fidelity, and leſſen their dignity and firmneſs. There is alſo ſome reaſon to fear that there may not be the moſt perfect agreement among them; and if a jealouſy in point of affection between them ſhould ariſe, it might be ſtill more fatal than a difference in opinion. You may obſerve, that Dr. Franklin particularly mentions the impropriety of having more miniſters than one, at one court and in the ſame place. We have felt the bad conſequences of that already in more inſtances than one. Congreſs were led into ſuch ſteps as ended in our parting with Mr. Lee, chiefly by the argument of his being diſagreeable to the French court; and though he was in my opinion one of the moſt able, faithful and active ſervants we ever had, and certainly one of the moſt diſintereſted—he was but barely able to go off, with a cold ceremonial adieu, that had very little in it of a grateful ſenſe of his ſervices, or cordial approbation. It is not pleaſant to reflect, Mr. Preſident, that ſo early in the hiſtory of this new ſtate, perſons in public employment ſhould be ſo prone to enter into ambitious contention, and puſh one another into diſgrace.

I cannot help putting you in mind, upon this ſubject, of what has juſt now come to light. You are informed by the French court, in the moſt authentic manner, and indeed if I am not miſtaken it is by implication at leaſt in the king's letter, that you had been ill ſerved by the people you employed there, and cheated both in point of quality and price; and that on this account they intend to give directions on that ſubject themſelves. Now, ſir, perhaps it may be news to many members of this body, that theſe were the very contracts made by Mr. Dean, without the knowledge or conſent of Mr. Lee, of which Mr. Lee loudly complained. Theſe were the very ſervants whoſe accounts Mr. Lee objected to, and whoſe conduct he cen-

ſured. But what did he get by it? Mr. Dean was ſupported by his venerable old friend, as he called him: Mr. Lee was complained of, as jealous and troubleſome, and diſagreeable to the court of France; and not only oppoſed and ſlighted by many members of this houſe, but I may ſay attacked and perſecuted in ſuch a manner, that if he had not been ſupported with a generous frankneſs by others, might have ended in public infamy.

I have juſt further upon this ſubject to obſerve, that you very lately ſent a new miniſter to the French court, Mr. Laurens—a meaſure much diſapproved by many; and it was then foretold, it would be a diſgraceful thing to Dr. Franklin. Probably he has conceived it in that light; and as he has no deſire at all to return home, I am well convinced that this is the true cauſe of the deſire expreſſed in his laſt letter to reſign his commiſſion.

Some have mentioned the importance of the matter, and that the chance is greater againſt corruption, where three are to be taken off, than one. It is very true, that *ceteries paribus*, as is commonly ſaid, there is a greater chance for one incorruptible perſon in three than in one; but there are ſingle perſons in whom I would confide as much as in ten. And beſides, the thing may be taken the other way; for there is a greater chance of finding one corruptible perſon in three than in one; and in a commiſſion of that nature, one traitor is able to do much miſchief, though the others are perfectly upright. He, being admitted into the ſecret, may not only diſcloſe meaſures, but perplex them, let the abilities of his colleagues be what they will. I have ſeen a man in Congreſs, who upon the ſuppoſition of his being a traitor, I am ſure had addreſs enough to draw many into his meaſures—many not contemptible in underſtanding, and ſincerely attached to their country's cauſe.

Before I conclude, I would ſay a little upon our circumſtances in another reſpect. The firſt appearances we make upon the public ſtage, are of conſequence. It is to be wiſhed therefore, that the credit of the United States were conſulted. If we were ſure that our commiſſioners would be immediately admitted to public and co-ordinate

feſſion with the other plenipotentiaries, perhaps a commiſſion of three would be auguſt and honorable; but if, as I ſtrongly ſuſpect will be the caſe, they are not at firſt publicly admitted at all, but obliged to negociate through the plenipotentiaries of France—if, as is not impoſſible, even in the ſettlement of the treaty, we are not conſidered as the formal contracting parties at all, but our intereſt attended to in articles as it were occaſionally introduced—if this is done, as a ſalvo to the honor of England, and to purchaſe for us advantages ſubſtantial and durable, a pompous commiſſion to a number of delegates will rather leſſen our dignity, and detract from our wiſdom and caution.

Upon the whole, ſir, I am of opinion that it would be much better to aſſign to one the commiſſion already given, with the inſtructions which have been cordially agreed upon, and ſeem to be in every reſpect agreeable to the deſires of the court of France, and the opinion of the king's miniſter in this country.

ON THE

PROPOSED MARKET

IN

GENERAL WASHINGTON'S CAMP.

To his Excellency General Washington, and the Officers of the American Army.

SIR,

ABOUT ten days ago, I was informed that you were conſulting with the farmers in the neighbourhood, and laying a plan for holding a market at the camp. This was to me, the moſt pleaſing news I had heard from camp for a long time. I ſuppoſed that you had now diſcovered the true and proper way of providing comforts and refreſhments to your ſoldiers, which, pardon me, I think has hitherto, in God's moſt holy will, been *hid from your eyes.* Laſt week's news-paper brought us the plan, in which I have been ſo much diſappointed, that I have taken pen in hand, to make a few remarks upon it, and ſubmit them to your view. Reſt aſſured that they come from a firm friend to American liberty, who has felt the tyranny of general Howe, and therefore holds him and his cauſe in deteſtation. You are not to expect from a plain country farmer, high ſounding language, and well turned phraſes—It is poſſible I may be held in deriſion for this, by ſome of your learned generals; for I am told you have ſome who can write full as well as they can fight, perhaps better; be that however as it may, I mean to write only of what I think I underſtand, and ſhall make uſe of the plaineſt words poſſible, that I may be underſtood.

I muſt begin by ſaying, that if you are under any difficulty in ſupplying your army, either with the neceſſaries or conveniencies of life, it is wholly owing to miſtaken principles, or unfaithful conduct in the manner of procuring them. You are in the midſt of a plentiful country—You command it by your ſword, except a ſmall ſpot in which the enemy is confined; and I moſt heartily wiſh you would pen them in cloſer than you do.—You have alſo the hearts of the country; for let people talk as they pleaſe of the number of tories, they are altogether inconſiderable to the friends of liberty, in every ſtate in this continent. When the Engliſh army leaves any place, we do not need your army to conquer it for us. All that were friends to them, fly with them, or ſkulk into corners, trembling for their lives. Let us conſider then how the matter ſtands—Your army conſiſts, I ſhall ſuppoſe at preſent, of 20,000 men; for though it was conſiderably larger lately, I reckon from the number gone home on recruiting parties, and for other reaſons, that may be about or near the truth. Suppoſe it however 25,000; if theſe were diſtributed one in every houſe, for the twenty-five thouſand houſes that are neareſt to the camp, they would not reach ſo far eaſt as the Delaware, nor ſo far weſt as Lancaſter; and though no proviſions were brought into that ſpace on their account, they could be well fed, and the burden never felt. This ſhows that the whole difficulty ariſes from the neceſſity of procuring and tranſporting proviſions to ſuch a number of men collected together in one place, a difficulty which one would think might be eaſily ſurmounted. It is not my intention at preſent, to make remarks on the commiſſary's department for ſupplying the capital neceſſaries, though I want not inclination. Suffice it to ſay, that for refreſhments and ſmaller neceſſaries, you are now making an attempt towards the only effectual way, viz. a market, or in other words, inviting people to bring them to you of their own accord.

Now, Sir, I have read and conſidered your plan, the chief part of which is ſettling the prices of a variety of articles, which it is expected will be expoſed to ſale. Fixing the price of commodities, has been attempted by law

in ſeveral ſtates among us, and it has increaſed the evil it was meant to remedy, as the ſame practice ever has done ſince the beginning of the world. Such laws, when they only ſay men ſhall be puniſhed if they ſell at any higher prices than the legal, and that if any will not ſell at theſe prices, their goods ſhall be taken by force, have ſome meaning in them, though little wiſdom: but to publiſh a liſt of fixed prices, as an encouragement to a weekly market, is a new ſtrain of policy indeed. If people bring their goods to market, and are willing to ſell them at theſe, or lower prices, is not that enough? and if they are not willing to ſell, how ſhall they be made willing to come? Probably you were told theſe were reaſonable prices; now I ſhall be glad to know what you call a reaſonable price. If it be that which is proportioned to the demand on the one ſide, and the plenty or ſcarcity of goods on the other, I agree to it; but I affirm that this will fix of itſelf, by the conſent of the buyer and ſeller, better than it can be done by any politician upon earth. If you mean any thing elſe, it ſignifies nothing at all, whether it be *reasonable* or not; for if it is not *agreeable*, as well as reaſonable, you might have one market day, but not a ſecond. There are ſome things which are not the object of human laws, and ſuch are all thoſe that eſſentially depend for their ſucceſs upon inward inclination. Laws, force, or any kind of limitation, are ſo far from having any tendency of themſelves, to perſuade or incline, that they have generally the contrary effect. It would be much to the advantage of many lawgivers and other perſons in authority, if they would carefully diſtinguiſh between what is to be effected by force, and what by perſuaſion, and never prepoſterouſly mix theſe oppoſite principles, and defeat the operation of both. Laws and authority compel; but it is reaſon and intereſt that muſt perſuade.

The fixing of prices by authority, is not only impolitic, as I have ſhewn above, but it is in itſelf unreaſonable and abſurd. There are ſo many different circumſtances to be taken in to conſtitute equality or juſtice in ſuch matters, that they cannot be all attended to, or even aſcertained. The plenty of one kind of proviſion, and ſcarcity of ano-

ther—The plenty in one corner of the country, and scarcity in another—the distance of one place, and nearness of another—The changes of circumstances in the course of a few weeks or days—Good or bad roads, or good or bad weather—The comparative quality of the goods—These, and an hundred other circumstances which can never be foreseen, actually govern the prices of goods at market, and ought to govern them. If a price is just to one who brings his goods fifteen miles, it is certainly too much for one who brings them only one. If ten pence per pound is a just price for veal at present, I am certain it must be too much a month hence, when veal will be much more plentiful. If one shilling and four pence per pound is reasonable for a fat turkey, ought not I to have more for a fatter, which is both better in its quality and weight—being lighter to its bulk, because fat is not so heavy as either lean flesh or bones. If it is reasonable to pay me one shilling per pound for any meat in a good day, I shall expect more if I go out in a storm; if not, I will stay at home on a bad day, and so you must starve one week, and pamper the next.

All these circumstances you must allow to restrain and limit one another. He who is nearest, and has goods in plenty, will by selling cheap, moderate the demands of him who comes far. If you pay very dear for any article one day, the news of that spreading abroad, brings in prodigious quantities, and the price falls, and so it happens in every other case. Thus it appears that it is out of your power to tell what is a reasonable price, and by attempting to do it, you not only refuse to gratify the expectations of the people, but you treat them with unjustice.

I have one more remark to make upon this subject; that to fix the prices of goods, especially provisions in a market, is as impracticable as it is unreasonable. The whole persons concerned, buyers and sellers, will use every art to defeat it, and will certainly succeed.— —

— — — — — —

ADDRESS

TO

GENERAL WASHINGTON.

THE Preſident and Faculty of the College of New Jerſey, beg leave to embrace this opportunity of congratulating your Excellency on the preſent happy and promiſing ſtate of public affairs; and of ſincerely wiſhing you proſperity and ſucceſs in the enſuing campaign, and in what may yet remain of the important conflict in which the United States are engaged.

As this College, devoted to the intereſts of religion and learning, was among the firſt places of America, that ſuffered from the ravages of the enemy—ſo, happily, this place and neighbourhood was the ſcene of one of the moſt important and ſeaſonable checks which they received in their progreſs. The ſurpriſe of the Heſſians at Trenton, and the ſubſequent victory at Princeton, redounded much to the honor of the commander who planned, and the handful of troops which executed the meaſures; yet were they even of greater moment to the cauſe of America, than they were brilliant as particular military exploits.

We contemplate and adore the wiſdom and goodneſs of divine Providence, as diſplayed in favor of the United States, in many inſtances during the courſe of the war; but in none more than in the unanimous appointment of your Excellency to the command of the army. When we conſider

the continuance of your life and health—the diſcernment, prudence, fortitude and patience of your conduct, by which you have not only ſacrificed, as others have done, perſonal eaſe and property, but frequently even reputation itſelf, in the public cauſe, chuſing rather to riſque your own name than expoſe the nakedneſs of your country—when we conſider the great and growing attachment of the army, and the cordial eſteem of all ranks of men, and of every ſtate in the Union, which you have ſo long enjoyed—we cannot help being of opinion, that God himſelf has raiſed you up as a fit and proper inſtrument for eſtabliſhing and ſecuring the liberty and happineſs of theſe States.

We pray that the Almighty may continue to protect and bleſs you—that the late ſignal ſucceſs of the American arms, may pave the way to a ſpeedy and laſting peace; and that, having ſurvived ſo much fatigue, and ſo many dangers, you may enjoy many years of honorable repoſe in the boſom of your grateful country.

JOHN WITHERSPOON.

Memorial and Manifesto

OF THE

UNITED STATES

OF

NORTH-AMERICA,

To the Mediating Powers in the Conferences for Peace, to the other Powers in Europe, and in general to all who shall see the same.

THE United States of North-America, having been made acquainted, by their illuſtrious ally the king of France, that there is a propoſal for holding a congreſs under the mediation of the empreſs of Ruſſia and the emperor of Germany, to treat of terms of accommodation with Great-Britain have thought proper to publiſh, for the information of all concerned, the following memorial, which ſhall contain a brief detail of the ſteps by which they have been brought into their preſent intereſting and critical ſituation.

The United States (formerly Britiſh colonies) were firſt planted and ſettled by emigrants from that country. Theſe ſettlers came out at different times, and with differ-

ent views. Some were actuated by the ſpirit of curioſity and enterpriſe, which was ſo prevalent in Europe in the ſixteenth and ſeventeenth centuries; ſome were chiefly induced by the hope of riches; and ſome were driven from their native country by the iron rod of ſacerdotal tyranny. They ſolicited their charters, and ſettled their governments on different principles, ſuch as beſt pleaſed thoſe who were chiefly concerned in each undertaking. In one thing, however, they all agreed, that they conſidered themſelves as bringing their liberty with them, and as entitled to all the rights and privileges of freemen under the Britiſh conſtitution.

Purſuant to theſe ſentiments, they looked upon it as the foundation ſtone of Britiſh liberty, that the freeholders or proprietors of the ſoil, ſhould have the excluſive right of granting money for public uſes, and therefore invariably proceeded upon this plan. With reſpect, indeed, to the whole of their internal government, they conſidered themſelves as not directly ſubject to the Britiſh parliament, but as ſeparate *independent* dominions under the ſame ſovereign, and with ſimilar co-ordinate juriſdiction. It appears from ſeveral events, that happened in the courſe of their hiſtory, and from public acts of ſome of their governments, that this was their opinion many years before the late unjuſt claims and oppreſſive acts, which gave birth to the bloody conflict not yet finiſhed.

From the firſt ſettlement of the colonies, they willingly ſubmitted to Britain's enjoying an excluſive right to their commerce; though ſeveral of the acts of the Britiſh parliament upon this ſubject, they always looked upon as partial and unjuſt. Some of theſe appear, at firſt view, to be ſuch badges of ſervitude, that it is ſurpriſing that a free people ſhould ever have been patient under them. The truth is, they would not probably have been ſubmitted to, but that the rigid execution of them at this diſtance was in its nature impoſſible.

It was always the opinion of the inhabitants of theſe ſtates, that the benefits which aroſe to Britain from the excluſive commerce of America, and the taxes which it enabled her to raiſe on her own ſubjects, was more than

their proportion of the common treaſure neceſſary to the defence of the empire. At the ſame time, great as it was, the loſs to them, by being confined in their trade, was greater than the benefit to her; as it obliged them to purchaſe any thing they had occaſion for from her, and at her own price, which neceſſarily retarded their growth and improvement. All this notwithſtanding, when any extraordinary emergency ſeemed to render it neceſſary, and when application was regularly made to the aſſemblies of the colonies, they complied in every inſtance with the requiſitions, and made advances of ſums which, in one or two inſtances, Britain herſelf conſidered as above their ability, and therefore made reſtitution or compenſation for them.

The true reaſon of this long and patient acquieſcence, was the natural and warm attachment which the inhabitants of America had to Great-Britain, as their parent country. They gloried in their relation to her; they were zealous for her honor and intereſt; imbibed her principles and prejudices with reſpect to other nations; entered into her quarrels, and were profuſe of their blood for the purpoſe of ſecuring or extending her dominion. Almoſt every city and county in Great Britain had its counter part, which bore its name in the new world; and thoſe whoſe progenitors for three generations had been born in America, when they ſpoke of going to Britain, called it going home.

Such was the ſtate of things, when ſome unwiſe counſellors to the Britiſh king, thought of raiſing a revenue without the conſent of the American legiſlatures, to be carried directly to the Engliſh treaſury. The firſt eſſay on this ſubject was the famous ſtamp act, of which we ſhall at preſent ſay nothing, but that the univerſal ferment raiſed on occaſion of it was a clear proof of the juſtneſs and truth of the preceding repreſentation. So odious was it over the whole country, and ſo dangerous to thoſe who attempted to carry it into execution, that in a ſhort time it was repealed by themſelves. Parliament, however, by their declaratory act, which paſſed in the ſame ſeſſion ſhewed that they intended to maintain the right,

though they desisted in this instance from the exercise of it, The Americans, overjoyed at the immediate deliverance, returned to their affection and attachment, hoping that the claim would again become dormant and that no occasion would be given for the future discussion of it.

But it was not long before the English ministry proposed and carried an act of parliament, imposing duties on tea, glass, &c. which by the smallness of the duties themselves, and several other circumstances, was plainly designed to steal upon us gradually, and if possible imperceptibly, the exercise of their pretended right. It was not, however, in their power to blind the colonies, who rose up against the execution of this act, with a zeal proportioned to the importance of the subject, and with an unanimity not to be expected but where a great and common danger keeps every cause of jealousy and dissention out of view. Not only every colony, by its representative body, but every county, and almost every corporation or other subordinate division, publicly declared that they would defend their liberty at the risk of their estates and lives. In the mean while the English government professed a determination equally firm to enforce the execution of this act by military power, and bring us to unconditional submission.

Thus did the rupture take place; and as to the justice of our cause, we must say, that if any impartial persons will read the declaratory act, that the lords and commons of Great-Britain in parliament, have a right to make laws binding upon the colonies *in all cases whatsoever*, and which was now producing its proper fruit, he must be convinced that had we submitted to it, we should have been in no respect different from a set of conquered, tributary states, subject to a foreign country; and the colonial assemblies would have become both useless and contemptible. The writings in England upon this subject, proving that we were represented *in Middlesex*, and using many other equally forcible arguments, are and will remain a disgrace to reason, as well as an insult on American understanding.

At this period of time not only the people of England in general, but the king of England in his ſpeeches, and his parliament in their addreſſes, affected to repreſent the commotions in America as raiſed by a few ſeditious perſons, and the conſequence of a pre-concerted ſcheme to throw off the dominion of Great-Britain, and ſet up an independent empire. This unjuſt and indeed abſurd accuſation may be refuted by a thouſand arguments. The ſtrong predilection of the people of America for the people, the faſhions, and the government of Britain, proves its falſhood. There was no perſon, nor any number of perſons in any ſtate of America, who had ſuch influence as to be able to effect this, or even view it as a probable object of ambition. But what muſt demonſtrate the abſurdity of this ſuppoſition, is the ſtate in which America was found when ſhe began to grapple with the power of Britain. No ſtep had been taken to open the way for obtaining foreign aid. No proviſion had been made of arms, ammunition, or warlike ſtores of any kind; ſo that the country ſeemed to be expoſed, naked and helpleſs, to the dominion of her enemy.

Agreeably to this, addreſſes and petitions were the means to which we had recourſe. Reconciliation to Britain, with the ſecurity and preſervation of our rights, was the wiſh of every ſoul. The moſt explicit profeſſions of loyalty to the prince, and the moſt expreſs aſſurances of effectual ſupport in his government, if we were called on in a conſtitutional way, made the ſubſtance of our declarations. Every ſucceeding petition, however, was treated with new and greater inſult, and was anſwered by acts of parliament, which for their cruelty will be a ſtain upon the annals of the kingdom, and bring the character of the nation itſelf into diſgrace.

Single acts of inhumanity may be accounted for from the depravity of an individual; but what ſhall we ſay of grave and numerous aſſemblies, enacting ſuch laws as the Boſton port bill, which reduced at once ſo many people to beggary, and their property itſelf to nothing—the act permitting thoſe charged with murdering Americans, to be ſent to England to be tried, that is to ſay, either not to

be tried at all, or certainly abſolved—the act appointing Americans taken at ſea, to be turned before the maſt in Engliſh ſhips, and obliged either to kill their own relations, or be killed by them—and the act appointing American priſoners to be ſent to the Eaſt-Indies as ſlaves. But what is of all moſt aſtoniſhing is, that they never failed to extol their own lenity, when paſſing ſuch acts as filled this whole continent with reſentment and horror. To crown the whole, the laſt petition ſent by congreſs to the king, which beſeeched him to appoint *some mode* by which our complaints might be remedied, and a way be paved for reconciliation, was treated with abſolute contempt, and no anſwer given to it of any kind. Thus was all intercourſe broken up. We were declared rebels; and they themſelves muſt confeſs, that no alternative was left us, but either to go with ropes about our necks, and ſubmit ourſelves, not to the king, but to the kingdom of England, to be trampled under foot, or riſk all the conſequences of open and vigorous reſiſtance.

The laſt part of the alternative we choſe without heſitation; and as it was impoſſible to preſerve civil order any longer under the name and form of a government which we had taken arms to oppoſe, we found it abſolutely neceſſary to declare ourſelves independent of that prince who had thrown us out of his protection. This great ſtep was taken with the full approbation, and indeed at the ardent deſire of the public at large. The extent and growth of the colonies ſeemed, in the nature of things, to call for ſuch a ſeparation long before; yet it would not probably have happened for many years, if it had not been forced upon us by the conduct of our unkind parent herſelf.—The thing indeed ſeems to have been the purpoſe of God Almighty; for every meaſure of the court of Great-Britain had the moſt direct tendency to haſten, and render it unavoidable.

We muſt take notice, that before the declaration of independence, there was ſomething like an attempt to reconcile us, commonly called lord North's conciliatory motion; but it was ſo trifling in its nature, and inſidious

in its form, that probably no ſucceſs was expected from it, even by thoſe who contrived it. Who does not perceive in it an artful attempt to divide us? and that while every thing elſe is left in the greateſt uncertainty, the main point for which we contended is clearly decided againſt us?

After the declaration of independence, lord and general Howe brought out a commiſſion for *giving peace to America.* But as they had not liberty ſo much as to acknowledge us by an open treaty, ſo the ſubſtance of what they offered was pardon upon ſubmiſſion; that the parliament would reviſe the acts they had paſſed, and if any of them were found improper, they would amend them: which, in one word, amounted to this, that they would do for *us* what they *themſelves* thought good. Theſe offers, however, poor as they were, came too late. So important a ſtep as the declaration of independence, could not be recalled; and the formidable armament ſent out againſt us in the year 1776, rendered it more neceſſary than ever.

We are ſorry to be obliged to take notice of the manner of conducting the war. It would be for the honor of humanity, that it could be buried in oblivion. Many were the inſtances of perſons, after they had ſubmitted and begged mercy on their knees, being murdered in cold blood. The treatment of priſoners was from the beginning, and has continued through the war, with ſome exceptions, ſavage and barbarous to the laſt degree. Multitudes, before any exchange took place, died by famine and ſtench. Many were, by threatening and ill uſage, conſtrained to enliſt in their enemy's ſervice; and many were forced on board their ſhips of war, or ſent to Britain to rot in priſon, at a diſtance from their friends, without hope of relief. It is not eaſy to enumerate the houſes and even towns which have been wantonly burnt, or to deſcribe the devaſtation of the country, and robbery of the inhabitants, wherever the army paſſed. To this may be added, hiring the ſavages to come upon the back ſettlements. There is the greater ſhame in this expedient, that they are not formidable either for their number or their valor, but for the ſhocking manner in which they

torture their priſoners, and murder women and infants who fall into their hands. Civilized nations will perhaps find it hard to believe this repreſentation ; but every part of it can be ſupported by the moſt unqueſtionable facts, and it is rendered credible not only by the circumſtance that civil wars are carried on commonly with a rancour and animoſity greater than thoſe between independent nations, but by the expreſſions of hatred and contempt which have been uſed with reſpect to the Americans, by almoſt every ſpeaker and writer in England. What effect could ſuch language have on the minds of the ſoldiery, but to ſteel them againſt all impreſſions of pity and tenderneſs, as we find was really the caſe, till they were reſtrained in ſome degree, by the fear of retaliation upon their people in our hands.

At laſt, after four years of real, and near two years of profeſſed and declared independence, it pleaſed God to incline the heart of the king of France to give relief to the oppreſſed, by entering into a treaty with the United States, on the moſt liberal and diſintereſted principles. No excluſive privileges are there ſtipulated for the French nation, but the ſecure, open and equal intercourſe to which all other nations are invited. This acknowledgment and ſupport from one of the moſt powerful monarchs in Europe, it may eaſily be ſuppoſed gave a new turn to our affairs, and a new dignity to our cauſe. The terms of this treaty, ſo favorable to us, as well as honorable to our ally, cannot fail to add the bond of gratitude to that of juſtice, and make our adherence to it inviolable.

Not long after this treaty was ſigned, the court and parliament of Great-Britain ſent out commiſſioners to make an offer of terms, which we readily confeſs were not only as good, but better, than what three years before would have been chearfully accepted. But the ground was now wholly changed. We were offered freedom from taxes, and even a ſpecies of independence itſelf, upon the *easy* terms of breaking our faith ſo lately pledged, and uniting our force with that of Great-Britain ; and both would doubtleſs have been immediately employed in taking vengeance on France for the aſſiſtance

ſhe had lent to us in our diſtreſs. Yet even here, the whole was to be ſubject to the reviſion of parliament; that is to ſay, any part of the agreement might be approved or rejected as to the wiſdom of that aſſembly ſhould ſeem meet.

Theſe laſt propoſals from Great-Britain, deſerve very particular notice. They are a clear dereliction of the firſt cauſe of quarrel, and an ample confeſſion that the demands of America were juſt; while the time and circumſtances of their being made, ſhew that they could not be accepted with any regard either to juſtice, gratitude, or policy. Could we be guilty of a direct breach of faith, when the ink was hardly dry by which our ratification of the treaty was marked? Could we inſtantly forget thoſe favors which had been ſo earneſtly ſolicited, as well as generouſly beſtowed? Could we, who had not entered into a league offenſive and defenſive with France, except for the preſent ſtruggle in our own behalf, becauſe we did not wiſh to be involved in the wars of Europe, throw ourſelves into the arms of an hoſtile nation, and promiſe to make peace or war with her, againſt our benefactors?

Upon the whole, ſince the American colonies were, from their extent and ſituation, ripe for a ſeparation from Great-Britain, and the nature of things ſeemed to demand it; ſince their growing power, added to that of Great-Britain, would give her ſuch a dominion of the ſea, as muſt be dangerous to the liberty and commerce of other nations; ſince, by her own acts of oppreſſion, ſhe has alienated the minds of the Americans, and compelled them to eſtabliſh independent governments, which have now taken place; and ſince theſe governments, which are diſtinct though confederated, wholly ſettled upon republican principles and fit only for agriculture and commerce, cannot be an object of jealouſy to other powers, but by free and open intercourſe with them a general benefit to all; it is to be hoped that the revolution which they have effected, will meet with univerſal approbation.

ON THE

CONTEST

BETWEEN

GREAT-BRITAIN AND AMERICA.

Philadelphia, September 3, 1778.

DEAR SIR,

YOUR very acceptable letter of the 21ſt of March, I received about the middle of June, and would have anſwered it long ago, if there had been any encouraging proſpect of conveying it ſafely. As to writing you a ſhort letter that muſt have gone open through the enemy's poſts, I did not think it worth while. I have however now come to a reſolution of writing you pretty fully, and trying to convey it by France or Holland; and if it ſhould fall into their hands, and never get to your's, there will be no other loſs than my time in writing; for as to any other conſequences, either to the public or to myſelf, I have not the leaſt apprehenſion.

Your letter came to me ſealed, and apparently never opened, in a packet from the Britiſh commiſſioners, which arrived at York-town while the congreſs was ſetting; and conſequently it, as well as one from Mr. F——, was delivered to me in preſence of the whole members. As

the ſame packet, beſides the public meſſage, contained ſome private letters addreſſed to particular members, ſome of them from governor Johnſtone, one of the commiſſioners, a propoſal was made by a member, who read publicly one received by himſelf, that every gentleman who had received private letters from any perſon with the enemy, ſhould deliver them to congreſs, that they might be read. This would have been attended with no difficulty as to me; except ſome family affairs in Mr. F——'s letter very improper to be publicly read, and ſome expreſſions in his letter a little offenſive ſpeaking of congreſs. However, it was not done at that time; and afterwards, in a diet at many days diſtance, every member who had received any ſuch letters, was called upon to read from them what related to public affairs, which was done.

I am and have been greatly concerned, as you ſeem to be, for the conteſt between Great-Britain and America; and certainly, from my own intereſt, have by far the greateſt reaſon of the two; and as I ſuppoſe it will be agreeable to you, ſhall make a few obſervations, 1. upon the public cauſe, and 2. on my own conduct, which I underſtand from many different quarters, to be highly blamed in my native country.

As to the public cauſe, I look upon the ſeparation of America from Britain to be the viſible intention of Providence; and believe that in the iſſue it will be to the benefit of this country, without any injury to the other—perhaps to the advantage of both. It ſeems to me the intention of Providence for many reaſons, which I cannot now enumerate, but in a particular manner for the following—that I cannot recollect any inſtance in hiſtory, in which a perſon or people have ſo totally and uniformly miſtaken the means for attaining their own ends, as the king and parliament of Britain have in this conteſt. I do ſeriouſly and poſitively affirm to you, my dear ſir, that it is my opinion, that congreſs itſelf, if they had been to direct the meaſures of the Britiſh miniſtry, could not or would not have directed them to meaſures ſo effectual to forward and eſtabliſh the independence of America, as thoſe which they choſe of their own accord. They have had a miſtaken opinion

of the ſtate of things in America, from the beginning to this hour, and have founded their whole conduct upon their miſtakes. They ſuppoſed ſometimes, that the people of America in general were ſeditious and factious—deſirous of a ſeparation from Great-Britain, and that their conduct on occaſion of the ſtamp-act was the effect of this diſpoſition. Nothing could be more untrue. I am a witneſs that the people of this country had an eſteem of, and attachment to the people of Great-Britain, exceedingly ſtrong. They were proud of them, and of their own deſcent from them. Britiſh faſhions, Britiſh goods, and even Britiſh perſons, were in the higheſt eſteem. A perſon educated in the old countries had a degree of rank and credit from that circumſtance, independent of every other. I think they were even partial in this reſpect. I believe, had I myſelf been born and educated in America, I ſhould have met with a degree of acceptance and ſucceſs in my ſtation, far inferior to what actually happened. When an American ſpoke of going to England, he always called it going home; and wherever you are in this country, you meet with almoſt nothing but counties, townſhips and houſes, called by Engliſh names. I live at Princeton in Middleſex county; and on the oppoſite ſide of the ſtreet is Somerſet county, and indeed I believe all the counties in New-Jerſey, are called by Engliſh names.

From this I deſire that you may infer, that the oppoſition made to the claims of parliament, aroſe from a deep and univerſal conviction in the people, that they were inconſiſtent with their own ſecurity and peace. In this I am ſatisfied that they judged right; for had the claim ſet up been acquieſced in, the provincial aſſemblies would have become contemptible and uſeleſs, and the whole colonies no better than a parcel of tributary ſtates, which, placed at ſo great a diſtance, would have been, from error, ignorance and ſelf-intereſt, loaded in the moſt inſupportable manner.

Another miſtake, into which the miniſtry and parliament of England fell, was that this was a deep-laid ſcheme of a few artful and deſigning men, who ſtirred up the multitude for their own ends; that the ſentiments in fa

vor of America, were by no means general; but that the artful leaders impoſed upon them. This I have ſeen aſſerted from the beginning to the end of the quarrel; and to complete the abſurdity, the very commiſſioners now here from Britain, continue to reaſon in the ſame manner—impeach the congreſs with ambitious and deſigning views, and ſeem diſpoſed to appeal to the people. Alas! they know nothing of the matter. The congreſs is a changeable body: members are going from it, and coming to it every month, nay every week. — —

— — — — — —

ON THE

AFFAIRS

OF THE

UNITED STATES.

Tusculum, near Princeton, March 20, 1780.

DEAR SIR,

I HAVE received a letter from you, dated June 11, 1778, a few days after I had written to you a long letter of the date September 21, that year. The design of it was to desire me to enquire after, and endeavor to procure the enlargement of one Alexander Muirhead, supposed to be carried into Boston, I immediately wrote to Boston myself, and caused one of the delegates of that state also to write; but we could hear nothing of him, so that probably he was not carried into that place.

Your favor of March 19, 1779, acknowledging the receipt of mine of the 21st of September preceding, I received in the month of August last year. I am to blame in not answering it sooner; but I had no inclination to send an open letter through the English posts, and any proper opportunity of sending it another way seldom occurs. This goes by a gentleman who means to get to Europe upon business, and has promised to take particular

care of it; so that I mean to embrace the opportunity of writing to you and some other of my friends. I am obliged to you for your particular private home news about Glasgow, and would be glad of the continuance of such intelligence, and the more so, if you would take in Paisley also.

I have been, since I wrote you last, in general in good health, and indeed am at present in better health than I have been since I had the last fit. Excepting these fits, and the weakness that followed upon them, my health has been good ever since I came to America; and that weakness has been chiefly a swimming in my head, and fear and uncertainty when I went to make a long discourse in public. It was the opinion of Dr. Rush, that these fits were something of the apoplectic kind. It is remarkable that for these twelve months past I have had almost constantly a succession of pimples, or rather small biles or blotches, about the temples, within the hair, and sometimes on the forehead; since which time I have been sensibly better and freer from the other complaint.

I have now left congress, not being able to support the expense of attending it, with the frequent journeys to Princeton, and being determined to give particular attention to the revival of the college. Professor Houston, however, our professor of mathematics, is a delegate this year; but he tells me he will certainly leave it next November. I mention this circumstance to confirm what I believe I wrote you formerly, that the members of congress in general, not only receive no profit from that office, but I believe five out of six of them, if not more, are great loosers in their private affairs. This cannot be otherwise; for as none of the delegates are allowed to have any lucrative office whatever, either in their own state or for the United States, though their expenses should be fully borne, their time is taken up, and their own private estates are neglected. At the end of the year 1778, I gave notice to our legislature that they must either not chuse me at all, or leave me at full liberty to attend only when I could conveniently. They chose me however, and I made a good deal of use of that liberty in the year 1779; and this year

all the delegates were changed but one, who had only been in one year, and who has not a houſe to go home to, his eſtate being in the neighborhood of New-York.

My family are well ſo far as I know. The truſtees of the college have laſt September choſe my ſon-in law, Mr. Smith, profeſſor of moral philoſophy. He came to Princeton with his family in December. To him I gave up my houſe at college, and devolved upon him the whole buſineſs of boarding young gentlemen, and retired to my houſe in the country, at the diſtance of one mile, and in full ſight of Princeton. This I have had in view for ſome years, and intend to ſpend the remainder of my life, if poſſible, *in otio cum dignitate.* You know I was always fond of being a ſcientific farmer. That diſpoſition has not loſt but gathered ſtrength, ſince my being in America. In this reſpect I got a dreadful ſtroke indeed from the Engliſh when they were here, they having ſeized and moſtly deſtroyed my whole ſtock, and committed ſuch ravages that we are not yet fully recovered from it. My (now) eldeſt ſon ſailed in October laſt for France, with Mr. Girard and Mr. Jay, late preſident of congreſs. He is to purchaſe a few medicines and inſtruments in Europe, and return to proſecute his buſineſs as a phyſician. My other ſon was ſtudying law; but for the mean while, is private ſecretary to the preſent preſident of Congreſs, and my youngeſt daughter is at home.

As to public affairs, it ſeems to be yet uncertain whether we ſhall have peace ſoon. Greatly do I and many others in America deſire it; and yet, were our condition ten times worſe than it is, nothing ſhort of the clear independence of this country would be accepted. I obſerve, by your letter of the 19th of March laſt year, that you had a high opinion of your ſucceſſes at St. Lucia, in Georgia, and againſt the French trade. I believe before the end of the campaign, there was little reaſon to boaſt of your ſucceſs upon the whole. I mentioned to you in my laſt how obſtinately the court of England continued in erroneous opinions reſpecting America; and now I think that obſtinacy has become incurable. It is plain that they ſtill

harp upon the ſame ſtring, that a few leading men in congreſs ſtir up the people, and perſuade them to continue the conteſt. Allow me to aſſure you that this is one of the moſt abſurd and groundleſs opinions that ever was formed. The congreſs is changing every day. There is no inſtance in the whole conteſt, in which the public opinion did not go before their reſolutions. To go back to the very beginning—the declaration of independence was forced upon the majority of the then congreſs, by the people in general; and, in conſequence of ſubſequent elections, every ſix months that I have been in congreſs has weakened the party that was ſuſpected of coldneſs upon that ſubject; and now perhaps I may ſay it is annihilated.

I have read lately your parliamentary enquiry into the cauſes of your want of ſucceſs in America. The examination of Galloway in particular is a curioſity. I know that he, and ſuch as he, are blinded and ſtupified to an almoſt incredible degree, by their prejudices; and yet it is hard to ſuppoſe that he thought as he ſaid in all points. For example, when he endeavors to make it believed that the difficulty of ſupplying general Waſhington's army aroſe from the diſaffection of the country to his cauſe. I admit that he was in the winter 1777, in a part of the country where there are more people either cool or diſaffected to the cauſe of America, than in any other on the continent; and yet his want of ſupplies did not ariſe from that in the leaſt degree. It aroſe from the ſtate of our money. If he and his commiſſaries had had as much hard money as general Howe, he would have had all the proviſions in the country laid down at his tent door.

I am not only fully ſenſible, by a general knowledge of the country in this and other ſtates, that the public mind is entirely on the ſide of liberty, and for the independence of America—but I could mention a great many facts and circumſtances as evidences of it, ſtronger than could well be imagined, and indeed which have turned out ſtronger than even my expectations. One circumſtance is alone deciſive upon this ſubject, which is well known to yourſelves, that the moment your army leaves any part of the

country, it is not only loſt to you, but returns ſo ſtrongly to the intereſt of congreſs, that all the perſons known to have been attached to you are obliged to fly with terror and confuſion. But there is another ſtrong circumſtance. the univerſal attachment of the people to the French alliance. In vain have your partiſans endeavored to alarm the people with the fears of popery and arbitrary power. It makes not the leaſt impreſſion even upon the common people.

Pleaſe to attend to the circumſtance I am going to mention; becauſe it ſurpriſed myſelf when I obſerved it. There are always, you know, little feuds and contentions, jealouſy and emulation, in every ſociety and in every aſſociation. Both in congreſs and in the country, I have obſerved that when one ſet or faction wants to make the other odious, they charge them with being cold to the French alliance, and ungrateful to them for their ſervices. This, to my knowledge, has been the ſubject of mutual reproaches, when I do not believe there was any truth in it on either ſide. Would you think it—ſome have ſeriouſly attempted to perſuade me that the New-England delegates were cold to the French, and inclined to the Engliſh; to which I anſwered, that I well knew the contrary, but that they were of an independant ſpirit, and would not eaſily ſubmit to unwarrantable influence, either from the French or the Engliſh. I mention all this ſingly with this view, to ſhew you the bent and inclination of the public mind.

I have been lately reading over governor Johnſton's ſpeech after his return, in which to my amazement he poſitively and publicly denies his having ſent any meſſage by a lady to Mr. Reed. The thing is now publicly known and confeſſed. He ſays they would have named the lady if there had been any ſuch thing. Mr. Reed forbore naming the lady out of tenderneſs to her; but it has now come out. It was Mrs. F——, daughter of the late Dr. G——, married to Mr. F——, ſon of R. F——, of ——————. What ſhould people think of perſons of his character ſo boldly and ſolemnly to deny a certain fact.

I will mention another circumſtance to you. The diſtreſs of this country by the depreciation of the money, has been very great. Many have ſuffered great loſſes; not a few have been utterly ruined. Yet I never could perceive that this altered the inclination of the people as to the public cauſe, in the leaſt. Nay, notwithſtanding the dreadful complaints made againſt particular claſſes of men, ſuch as foreſtallers and engroſſers, commiſſaries and quartermaſters, yet I am perſuaded that any body who ſhould but propoſe to return to ſubmiſſion to England for relief from their depredations, would be torn in pieces.

OBSERVATIONS

ON THE

IMPROVEMENT OF AMERICA.

NORTH AMERICA is at preſent from the natural courſe of things, in a growing ſtate. It will therefore of itſelf, for a ſeries of years, gradually improve. There are however many things by which that improvement may be facilitated or retarded; and it is the laudable purpoſe of this ſociety, to attend to theſe circumſtances with care, and uſe their utmoſt endeavors to encourage the one and to remove the other. Having had the honor of being admitted a member of this ſociety, and not having it much in my power any otherwiſe to promote American improvements, I could not reſiſt the inclination I felt to digeſt and put in writing, a few reflections upon the police of countries in general, the great principles on which the Philadelphia Society ought to proceed, and perhaps I may propoſe ſome particular regulations.

1. The moral cauſes of the proſperity of a country, are almoſt infinitely more powerful than thoſe that are only occaſional. This obſervation is taken from Monteſquieu, by whom it is admirably illuſtrated, and it ought never to be out of view, with thoſe who wiſh to promote the general good. The moral cauſes ariſe from the nature of the government, including the adminiſtration of juſtice, liberty of conſcience, the partition of property. The riſe of a particular town, the cultivation and beauty of a particular

quarter of a country, may ſometimes be juſtly aſcribed to the ſurpriſing effects of a ſingle perſon who ſet the example; yet he was only the occaſion, properly ſpeaking, of the vigorous exertion. The conſequences could never be general or laſting, if there was not a diſpoſition to it in the conſtitution of the country. Therefore, a ſacred regard ſhould be had by every lover of mankind, to the principles of equity and liberty, that they may never be violated by any public proceedings. Pennſylvania is ſo happy in this particular, that its conſtitution need not be improved, but preſerved and defended.

2. It is extremely difficult, after you depart from general principles, to diſcover what particular regulations will be for the intereſt of a country. It requires a very comprehenſive mind, and a thorough knowledge of the courſe of trade and police in general. Beſides, it is not only difficult, but impoſſible to foreſee what circumſtances may afterwards occur. Many things are uſeful and expedient at one time, which in a few years become unneceſſary or hurtful. Nay, many ſelfiſh laws have operated from the beginning, in a manner directly contrary to what was expected. The incorporation of trades in the cities in Britain, is an inſtance of the firſt: and almoſt every law made to the prejudice of Ireland, is an example of the laſt. — — — — —

— — — — — —

SUPPLICATION

OF

J. R********.

To his Excellency Henry Laurens, Esquire, President, and other, the Members of the Honorable, the American Congress, &c. &c. &c.

The humble representation and earnest supplication of J. R———. printer and bookseller in New-York,

RESPECTFULLY SHEWETH,

THAT a great part of the Britiſh forces has already left this city, and from many ſymptoms there is reaſon to ſuſpect, that the remainder will ſpeedily follow them. Where they are gone or going, is perhaps known to themſelves, perhaps not; certainly however, it is unknown to us, the loyal inhabitants of the place, and other friends of government who have taken refuge in it, and who are therefore filled with diſtreſs and terror on the unhappy occaſion.

That as ſoon as the evacuation is completed, it is more than probable, the city will be taken poſſeſſion of by the forces of your high mightineſſes, followed by vaſt crouds of other perſons—whigs by nature and profeſſion—friends to the liberties, and foes to the enemies of America. Above all, it will undoubtedly be filled with ſhoals of

Yankies, that is to say, the natives and inhabitants (or as a great lady in this metropolis generally expresses it, the *wretches*) of New-England.

That from several circumstances, there is reason to fear that the behavior of the wretches aforesaid, may not be altogether gentle to such of the friends of government as shall stay behind. What the governing powers of the state of New-York may do also, it is impossible to foretel. Nay, who knows but we may soon see, *in propria persona*, as we have often heard of *Hortentius*, the governor of New-Jersey, a gentleman remarkable for severely handling those whom he calls traitors, and indeed who has exalted some of them (quanquam animus meminisse horret lectuque refugit) to a high, though dependent station, and brought *America under their feet*, in a sense very different from what Lord North meant when he first used that celebrated expression.

That your petitioner in particular, is at the greatest loss what to resolve upon, or how to shape his course. He has no desire at all, either to be roasted in Florida, or frozen to death in Canada or Nova Scotia. Being a great lover of fresh cod, he has had thoughts of trying a settlement in Newfoundland, but recollecting that the New-England men have almost all the same appetite, he was obliged to relinquish that project entirely. If he should go to Great-Britain, dangers no less formidable present themselves. Having been a bankrupt in London, it is not impossible that he might be accommodated with a lodging in Newgate, and that the ordinary there, might oblige him to say his prayers, a practice from which he hath had an insuperable aversion all his life long.

In this dreadful dilemma, he hath at least determined to apply to your high mightinesses, and by this memorial to *lay himself at your feet*, which he assures you, is the true modish phrase for respectful submission, according to the present etiquette of the court. Being informed however, that some of you are Presbyterians and Religionists, he has been also at some pains to find out a scripture warrant or example for his present conduct, and has happily found it, in the advice given by the servants of Benhadad,

king of Syria, to their maſter, 1 Kings xx. 31. *And his servants said unto him, behold now we have heard that the kings of Israel are merciful kings: Let us we pray thee, put sackcloth upon our loins, and ropes upon our heads, and go out to the king of Israel, peradventure he may save thy life. So they girded sackcloth upon their loins, and put ropes upon their heads, and came to the king of Israel, and said, Thy servant Benhadad saith, I pray thee let me live.* In like manner, O moſt mighty and venerable Congreſs-men, your ſervant J. R——— ſaith, I pray you let me live.

Having thus preferred my petition, I muſt now intreat leave to lay before your high mightineſſes, ſundry reaſons, which I hope will incline you to lend a favorable ear to it, in doing which, I ſhall uſe all poſſible plainneſs and candor.

1. In the firſt place, there cannot poſſibly be any danger to the United States, in ſuffering me to live. I know many of you think and ſay, that a tory heart acquires ſuch a degree of fourneſs and malevolence, in addition to its native ſtock, and ſuch a habit of treachery, by breaking through the moſt endearing ties of nature, that no good can be expected from it, nor any dependance placed upon it, let pretences or appearances be what they will. I remember alſo, about ſeven years ago a certain perſon hearing accidently one or two paragraphs read from the writings of an eminent controverſial divine in this country, ſaid, That fellow muſt be a turn coat; it is impoſſible that he could have been educated in the profeſſion which he now defends. What is your reaſon for that opinion? ſaid another gentleman who was preſent—Becauſe, ſays he, he diſcovers a rancor of ſpirit and rottenneſs of heart, unattainable by any other claſs of men. But I contend that theſe remarks relate only to the natives of this country, who like parricides took up arms for her deſtruction; and to apoſtates in religion; neither of which, I am certain, can be applied to me. I was born, as is well known, in old England; and as for the accuſation of apoſtacy, I ſet it at defiance, unleſs a man can be ſaid to fall off from what he was never on, or to depart from a place which he never ſaw.

But what I beg of you particularly to obſerve is, that let the diſpoſition to miſchief be as great as you pleaſe, where the ability is wanting, there can be no danger. I have often ſeen the lions in the tower of London without fear, becauſe there was an iron grate between me and them. Now it is certain that the tories in general, would do any thing ſooner than fight. Many of them became tories for no other reaſon, than that they might avoid fighting. The poor chicken-hearted creatures cried out to the potent King of England, to take them under his wings for protection, which he endeavored to do, but they were too ſhort to cover them. Even the late petition for arms in which they promiſed to go without the lines, and ſweep you all away with the beſom of deſtruction, was but an idle rhodomontade—It was ſomething like a poor boy ſhouting and ſinging in the dark, to keep himſelf from being afraid. At that very time, to my certain knowledge they would have given the world for a place to fly to, out of the reach of Waſhington and Gates. But I return to myſelf, *ego-met sum proximus mihi.* I can aſſure your high mightineſſes, that no danger can ariſe from me, for I am as great a coward as King James the VIth of Scotland, who could never ſee a naked ſword without trembling; having been, as it is ſaid, frightened in his mother's belly, when the fierce barrons of that country came in, and killed David Rizzio in his preſence. I was once ſeverely caned by a Scots officer now (if employed) in your ſervice. Though the gentlemen of that choleric nation have been very much our friends in the preſent controverſy, I find it is dangerous to offend them. Buchanan their own hiſtorian ſays, perfervidum eſt Scotorum in genium. Therefore by the by, or en paſſant, for I ſuppoſe you are at preſent beſt pleaſed with French phraſes, I would adviſe every man who regards his own peace, however ſmooth and gentle a Scotchman may appear, not to take him *against the hair*, as the ſaying is in their own country, but to remember the motto that ſurrounds the thiſtle, *Nemo me impune lacessat.* I Alſo very narrowly eſcaped a ſound beating from a New-England parſon, who was ſtrong enough, without either cane or cudgel, to have pound-

ed me to a mummy. All this, and much more of the same kind, I bore with the most exemplary patience and submission. Perhaps it will be said, that though no danger is to be apprehended from any deeds, yet I may do harm enough by words and writing. To this I answer, that I have expended and exhausted my whole faculty of that kind in the service of the English. I have tried falsehood and misrepresentation in every shape that could be thought of, so that it is like a coat thrice turned that will not hold a single stitch. My friend, Gen. Ro———n, told me some time ago in my own shop, that I had carried things so far that people could not believe one word I said, even though it were as true as the gospel. From all this I hope it plainly appears that there could be no danger from me; and therefore as you cannot surely think of being cruel for cruelty's sake, that you will suffer me to live.

II. Any further punishment upon me, or any other of the unhappy refugees who shall remain in N. York, will be altogether unnecessary, for they do suffer and will suffer from the nature of the thing, as much as a merciful man could wish to impose upon his greatest enemy. By this I mean the dreadful mortification (after our past puffing and vaunting) of being under the dominion of the Congress, seeing and hearing the conduct and discourse of the friends of America, and perhaps being put in mind of our own, in former times. You have probably seen many of the English newspapers, and also some of mine, and you have among you the *few* prisoners who by a miracle escaped death in our hands. By all these means you may learn with what infinite contempt, with what provoking insult, and with what unexampled barbarity, your people have, from the beginning to the end, been treated by the British officers, excepting a very small number, but above all by the tories and refugees, who not having the faculty of fighting, were obliged to lay out their whole wrath and malice in the article of speaking. I remember, when one of the prisoners taken after the *gallant* defence of Fort Washington had received several kicks for not being in his rank, he said, is this a way of treating a gentleman? The answer was, gentlemen? G— d——n your blood

who made you a gentleman? which was heard by us all present with unspeakable satisfaction, and ratified by general applause. I have also seen one of your officers, after long imprisonment, for want of clothes, food and lodging, as meagre as a skeleton and as dirty and shabby as a London beggar, when one of our friends would say with infinite humour, look you there is one of King Congs's ragged rascals. You must remember the many sweet names given you in print, in England and America, Rebels, Rascals, Raggamuffins, Tatterdemallions, scoundrels, Blackguards, Cowards, and Poltroons. You cannot be ignorant how many and how complete victories we gained over you, and what a fine figure you made in our narratives. We never once made you to *retreat*, seldom even to *fly* as a routed army, but to *run off into the woods*, to *scamper away through the fields*, and to *take to your heels as usual*. You will probably soon see the gazette account of the *defeat* of Mr. Washington at Monmouth. There it will appear how you scampered off, and how the English followed you and mowed you down, till their officers, with that humanity which is the *characteristic of the nation*, put a stop to this carnage, and then by a masterly stroke of generalship, stole a march in the night, lest you should have scampe red back again and obliged them to make a new slaughter in the morning.

Now, dear gentlemen, consider what a miserable affair it must be for a man to be obliged to apply with humility and self-abasement to those whom he hath so treated, nay, even to beg life of them, while his own heart upraids him with his past conduct, and perhaps his memory is refreshed with the repetition of some of his rhetorical flowers. It is generally said that our friend Burgoyne was treated with abundance of civility by general Gates, and yet I think it could not be very pleasing to him to see and hear the boys when he entered Albany, going before and crying *Elbow Room* for General Burgoyne there. Fear and trembling have already taken hold of many of the Refugees and friends of government in this place. It would break your hearts to hear poor Sam. S———, of Philadelphia, weeping and wailing, and yet he was a peaceable Quaker who did nothing in the world but hire guides

to the Engliſh parties who were going out to ſurprize and butcher you. My brother of trade, G— is ſo much affected, that ſome ſay he has loſt, or will ſoon loſe, his reaſon. For my own part I do not think I run any riſk in that reſpect. All the wiſdom that I was ever poſſeſſed of is in me ſtill, praiſed be God, and likely to be ſo. A man that has run the gauntlet of creditors, duns, and bailiffs, for years in England, and has been cudgelled, kicked, and p—d upon in America, is in no danger of loſing his reaſon by any circumſtance whatever, ſo long as there is the leaſt proſpect of ſaving his life. I have heard ſome people ſay that diſhonor was worſe than death, but with the great Sancho Pancha, I was always of a different opinion. I hope, therefore, your honors will conſider my ſufferings as ſufficient to atone for my offences, and allow me to continue in peace and quiet, and according to the North-Britiſh proverb, *sleep in a whole skin.*

III. I beg leave to ſuggeſt, that upon being received into favor, I think it would be in my power to ſerve the United States in ſeveral important reſpects. I believe many of your officers want politeneſs. They are like old Cincinnatus, taken from the plow; and therefore muſt ſtill have a little roughneſs in their manners and deportment. Now, I myſelf am the pink of courteſy, a genteel, portly, well-looking fellow, as you will ſee in a ſummer's day. I underſtand and poſſeſs the *bienseance*, the *manner*, the *grace*, ſo largely inſiſted on by lord Cheſterfield; and may without vanity ſay, I could teach it better than his lordſhip, who in that article has remarkably failed. I hear with pleaſure, that your people are pretty good ſcholars, and have made particularly very happy advances in the art of ſwearing, ſo eſſentially neceſſary to a gentleman. Yet I dare ſay they will themſelves confeſs, that they are ſtill in this reſpect far inferior to the Engliſh army. There is, by all accounts, a coarſeneſs and fameneſs in their expreſſion; whereas there is variety, ſprightlineſs and figure, in the oaths of gentlemen well educated. Dean Swift ſays very juſtly, 'a footman may ſwear, but he cannot ſwear like a lord.' Now we have many lords, in the Engliſh army, all of whom, when here, were pleaſed to honor

me with their friendſhip and intimacy; ſo that I hope my qualifications can hardly be diſputed. I have imported many of the moſt neceſſary articles for appearance in genteel life. I can give them Lavornitti's ſoap-balls, to waſh their brown hands clean, perfumed gloves, paint, powder, and pomatum. I can alſo furniſh the New-England men with rings, ſeals, ſwords, canes, ſnuff-boxes, tweezer-caſes, and many other ſuch *notions*, to carry home to their wives and miſtreſſes, who will be *nation*-glad to ſee them. You are alſo to know that I import a great many patent medicines, which may be of uſe to your army. It is ſaid that ſome of them are exceedingly liable to a diſorder called by phyſicians the *rancomania*, which is frequently followed by the two twin diſeaſes of plumbophobia and ſiderophobia. If they will but ſubmit to a ſtrict regimen, and take the tincture drops and pills which I prepare, I am confident the cure in moſt caſes would be infallible.

I have been informed, that a certain perſon, well known to your auguſt body, has clearly demonſtrated that virtue and ſeverity of manners are neceſſary to thoſe who would pull an old government down, which fete is now happily accompliſhed; but that luxury, diſſipation, and a taſte for pleaſures, are equally neceſſary to keep up a government already ſettled. As I ſuppoſe you are fully convinced of this moſt ſalutary truth, I take it for granted, now that you have ſettled governments in all the ſtates, you are looking out for proper perſons to ſoften the rigid virtue of the Americans, and lay them aſleep in the lap of ſelf-indulgence. Now, I am proud to ſay, that there is not a man on this continent more able to ſerve you in this reſpect, than myſelf. I have ſerved many of the Britiſh officers in a moſt honorable ſtation and character, of which the great Pandarus of Troy was the moſt ancient example. If I am happy enough to make my own converſation and manners the ſtandard of the mode, I believe you will ſee very powerful effects of it in a ſhort time. But if, after recovering your friendſhip myſelf, I am able alſo to bring back and reconcile to his country the Rev. Dr. A——, I believe the ſyſtem will be perfect. That gentleman, by

his robuſt form, is well fitted to be an eccleſiaſtical bruiſer, if ſuch an officer ſhould be needed; and, with all due deference to the officers of the American army, I ſhould think that, a better way of terminating differences among them in the laſt reſort than ſword or piſtol, for many obvious reaſons. He has alſo diſtinguiſhed himſelf by the publication of ſome poems, on ſubjects extremely well ſuited to the character of a Chriſtian clergyman, and very proper for initiating the tender mind in the ſofteſt and moſt delicious of all arts, viz. the art of love.

Finally, I hope I may be of ſervice to the United States, as a writer, publiſher, collector, and maker of news. I mention this with ſome diffidence; becauſe perhaps you will think I have foreclоſed myſelf from ſuch a claim, by confeſſing (as above) that my credit as a newſ-writer is broken by over-ſtretching. But it is common enough for a man in buſineſs, when his credit is wholly gone in one place, by ſhifting his ground, and taking a new departure, to flouriſh away, and make as great or greater figure than before. How long that ſplendor will laſt is another matter, and belongs to an after conſideration. I might therefore, though my credit is gone in New-York, ſet up again in the place which is honored with your reſidence. Beſides, I might write thoſe things only or chiefly, which you wiſh to be diſbelieved, and thus render you the moſt eſſential ſervice. This would be aiming and arriving at the ſame point, by *manœuvring retrogade*. Once more, as I have been the oſtenſible printer of other people's lies in New-York, what is to hinder me from keeping incog. and inventing or poliſhing lies, to be iſſued from the preſs of another printer in Philadelphia? In one, or more, or all of theſe ways, I hope to merrit your approbation. It would be endleſs to mention all my devices; and therefore I will only ſay further, that I can take a truth, and ſo puff and ſwell and adorn it, ſtill keeping the proportion of its parts, but enlarging their dimenſions, that you could hardly diſcover where the falſehood lay, in caſe of a ſtrict inveſtigation.

That I may not weary you, I conclude with recommending myself to your kind countenance and protection; and in the mean time, waiting for a favorable answer, your petitioner, as in duty bound, shall ever pray, &c.

RECANTATION

OF

Benjamin Towne.

The following was printed in Loudon's New-York Packet, published at Fishkill, October 1st, 1778.

THE following facts are well known. 1ſt. That I Benjamin Towne uſed to print the Pennſylvania Evening Poſt, under the protection of Congreſs, and did frequently, and earneſtly ſolicit ſundry members of the ſaid Congreſs for diſſertations and articles of intelligence, profeſſing myſelf to be a very firm and zealous friend to American liberty. 2d. That on the Engliſh taking poſſeſſion of Philadelphia, I turned fairly round, and printed my Evening Poſt under the protection of General Howe and his army, calling the Congreſs and all their adherents, rebels, raſcals, and raggamuffins, and ſeveral other unfavory names, with which the humane and polite Engliſh are pleaſed to honor them. Neither did I ever refuſe to inſert any diſſertation however ſcurrilous, or any article of intelligence ſent to me, although many of them I well knew to be, as a certain gentleman elegantly expreſſes it, *facts that never happened.* 3d. That I am now willing and deſirous to turn once more, to

unſay all that I have laſt ſaid, and to print and publiſh for the United States of America, which are likely to be uppermoſt, againſt the Britiſh tyrant; nor will I be backward in calling him, after the example of the great and eminent author of Common Senſe, *The Royal Brute*, or giving him any other appellation ſtill more approbrious, if ſuch can be found.

The facts being thus ſtated, (I will preſume to ſay altogether fairly and fully) I proceed to obſerve, that I am not only proſcribed by the Preſident and Supreme executive council of Pennſylvania, but that ſeveral other perſons are for reprobating my paper, and alledge that inſtead of being ſuffered to print, I ought to be hanged as a traitor to my country. On this account I have thought proper to publiſh the following humble confeſſion, declaration, recantation and apology, hoping that it will aſſuage the wrath of my enemies, and in ſome degree reſtore me to the favor and indulgence of the public. In the firſt place then, I deſire it may be obſerved, that I never was, nor ever pretended to be a man of character, repute or dignity. I was originally an underſtrapper to the *famous Galloway* in his *infamous* ſquabble with Goddard, and did in that ſervice contract ſuch a habit of meanneſs in thinking, and ſcurrility in writing, that nothing *exalted*, as brother Bell provedore to the ſentimentaliſts, would ſay, could ever be expected from me. Now, changing ſides is not any way ſurpriſing in a perſon anſwering the above deſcription. I remember to have read in the Roman hiſtory, that when Cato of Utica had put himſelf to death, being unable to ſurvive the diſſolution of the republic, and the extinction of liberty; another ſenator of inferior note, whoſe name I cannot recollect, did the ſame thing. But what thanks did he receive for this? The men of reflection only laughed at his abſurd imitation of ſo great a perſonage, and ſaid—he might have lived though the republic had come to its period. Had a Hancock or an Adams changed ſides, I grant you they would have deſerved no quarter, and I believe would have received none; but to paſs the ſame judgment on the conduct of an obſcure printer is miſ-

erable reaſoning indeed. After all, why ſo much noiſe about a trifle? What occaſion is there for the public to pour out all its wrath upon poor Towne; are turn-coats ſo rare? Do they not walk on every ſide? Have we not ſeen Dr. S——, J—— A——, T—— C——, and many others who were firſt champions for liberty; then friends to government,—and now diſcover a laudable inclination to fall into their ranks as quiet and orderly ſubjects of the commonwealth of Pennſylvania. The rational moraliſts of the laſt age uſed to tell us that there was an eſſential difference between virtue and vice, becauſe there was an eſſential difference to be obſerved in the nature and reaſon of things. Now, with all due deference to theſe great men, I think I am as much of a philoſopher as to know that there are no circumſtances of action, more important than thoſe of time and place. Therefore if a man pay no regard to the changes that may happen in theſe circumſtances, there will be very little virtue, and ſtill leſs *prudence* in his behaviour. Perhaps I have got rather too deep for common readers, and therefore ſhall aſk any plain quaker in this city what he would ſay to a man who ſhould wear the ſame coat in ſummer as in winter in this climate? He would certainly ſay, "Friend, thy wiſdom is not great." Now whether I have not had as good reaſon to change my conduct as my coat, ſince laſt January, I leave to every impartial perſon to determine. 2. I do hereby declare and confeſs, that when I printed for Congreſs, and on the ſide of liberty it was not by any means from principle, or a deſire that the cauſe of liberty ſhould prevail, but purely and ſimply from the love of gain. I could have made nothing but tar and feathers by printing againſt them as things then ſtood. I make this candid acknowledgment not only as a penitent to obtain pardon, but to ſhow that there was more conſiſtency in my conduct than my enemies are willing to allow. They are pleaſed to charge me with hypocriſy in pretending to be a whig when I was none. This charge is falſe; I was neither whig nor tory, but a printer. I deteſt and abhor hypocriſy. I had no more regard for General Howe or

General Clinton, or even Mrs. Lowring or any other of the *chaste nymphs* that attended the Fete Champetre, alias Miſchianza when I printed in their behalf, than for the Congreſs on the day of their retreat. It is pretended that I certainly did in my heart incline to the Engliſh, becauſe I printed much bigger lies and in greater number for them, than for the Congreſs. This is a moſt falſe and unjuſt inſinuation. It was entirely the fault of the Congreſs themſelves, who thought fit (being but a new potentate in the earth) to be much more modeſt, and keep nearer the truth than their adverſaries. Had any of them brought me in a lie as big as a mountain it ſhould have iſſued from my preſs. This gives me an opportunity of ſhowing the folly as well as malignity of thoſe who are actuated by party ſpirit; many of them have affirmed that I printed monſtrous and *incredible* lies for General Howe. Now pray what harm could incredible lies do? The only hurt, I conceive, that any lie can do, is by obtaining belief, as a truth; but an incredible lie can obtain no belief, and therefore at leaſt muſt be perfectly harmleſs. What will thoſe cavillers think, if I ſhould turn this argument againſt them, and ſay that the moſt effectual way to diſgrace any cauſe is to publiſh monſtrous and incredible lies in its favor. In this view, I have not only innocence, but ſome degree of merit to plead. However, take it which way you will, there never was a lie publiſhed in Philadelphia that could bear the leaſt compariſon with thoſe publiſhed by J—— R———— in New-York. This in my opinion is to be imputed to the ſuperiority not of the printer, but of the prompter or prompters. I reckon Mr. T—— to have excelled in that branch; and probably he had many coadjutors. What do you think of 40,000 Ruffians, and 20,000 Moors, which Moors too were ſaid by Mr. R———— to be dreadful among the women? As alſo of the boats building at the forks of Monongahela to carry the Congreſs down the Ohio to New-Orleans? Theſe were ſwingers.—As to myſelf and friend H————, we contented ourſelves with publiſhing affidavits to prove that the king of France was determined to preſerve the friendſhip that ſub-

ſiſted between him and his good brother the king of England, of which he has given a *new proof*, by entering into and communicating his treaty with the United States of America. Upon the whole I hope the public will attribute my conduct, not to diſaffection, but to attachment to my own intereſt and deſire of gain in my profeſſion; a principle, if I miſtake not, pretty general and pretty powerful in the preſent day.

3dly. I hope the public will conſider that I have been a timorous man, or, if you will, a coward, from my youth, ſo that I cannot fight,—my belly is ſo big that I cannot run,—and I am ſo great a lover of eating and drinking that I cannot ſtarve. When thoſe three things are conſidered I hope they will fully account for my paſt conduct, and procure me the liberty of going on in the ſame *uniform* tenor for the future. No juſt judgment can be formed of a man's character and conduct unleſs every circumſtance is taken in and fairly attended to; I therefore hope that this juſtice will be done in my caſe. I am alſo verily perſuaded that if all thoſe who are cowards as well as myſelf, but who are better off in other reſpects, and therefore *can* and *do run* whenever danger is near them, would befriend me, I ſhould have no inconſiderable body on my ſide. Peace be with the Congreſs and the army; I mean no reflections; but the world is a wide field, and I wiſh every body would do as they would be done by. Finally, I do hereby recant, draw back, eat in, and ſwallow down, every word that I have ever ſpoken, written or printed to the prejudice of the United States of America, hoping it will not only ſatisfy the good people in general, but alſo all thoſe ſcatter-brained fellows, who call one another out to ſhoot piſtols in the air, while they tremble ſo much that they cannot hit the mark. In the mean time I will return to labor with aſſiduity in my lawful calling, and eſſays and intelligence as before ſhall be gratefully accepted by the public's moſt obedient humble ſervant,

BENJAMIN TOWNE.

A

DESCRIPTION OF THE STATE

OF

NEW-JERSEY.

Answers in Part to Mr. Marbois's Questions respecting New-Jersey.

I. NEW-JERSEY is bounded on the north by a line drawn from the North or Hudſon's river to the boundary of Pennſylvania, fixed about ten years ago by commiſſioners appointed from New-York and New-Jerſey, and marked in all theſe late maps. This line runs nearly weſt, and paſſes about thirty miles north of Morris-town in New-Jerſey.

It is bounded on the eaſt by Hudſon's river, from the line juſt now mentioned to the ſea.

It is bounded on the ſouth by the Atlantic Ocean, from the mouth of Hudſon's river to Cape May, at the mouth of Delaware Bay. And on the weſt by the Delaware, to the place where the firſt mentioned line ſtrikes it, between two and three hundred miles from the ſea.

II. Smith's Hiſtory of New-Jerſey is the only publication that can anſwer the deſign of this query.

III. New-Jerſey conſiſts of thirteen counties, which, beginning at Cape May on the Delaware Bay, lie in the following order: Cape May, Salem, Cumberland, Glouceſter, Burlington, Hunterdon, Suſſex, Morris, Bergen, Eſſex, Somerſet, Middleſex, Monmouth. Theſe counties are ſub-divided into townſhips or precincts.

There are no cities in New-Jerſey, but Burlington and Perth Amboy, which were ſeverally the capitals of Eaſt and Weſt Jerſey, as will be ſeen by the patents and hiſtory of the ſettlement.

The chief villages, or conſiderable places in New-Jerſey, are Haddonfield, Mountholly, Burdentown, Trenton, Princeton, Brunſwick, Morriſtown, Springfield, Woodbridge, Elizabeth-town, Newark, Hackenſack, Pittſtown, Cranberry, Shrewſbury, Allentown, Pennington, and ſome others of leſs note.

The only river of conſiderable extent in New-Jerſey, is the Raritan; the two branches of which paſſing through the north-eaſtern parts of the ſtate, unite near twenty miles above Brunſwick, and receiving the Milſtone and ſome other ſmaller ſtreams, it becomes navigable about two miles above Brunſwick, and from thence to Amboy bay, about twenty miles by water, is navigated by ſhallops and ſmall veſſels of one hundred or one hundred and fifty tons.

South river paſſes through Cranberry, in Middleſex county, and empties itſelf into the Raritan before it reaches Amboy.

Black river is a conſiderable ſtream, paſſing through Morris county eaſtward, and empties itſelf into Hudſon's river.

Paſſaic river paſſes through Bergen county, and enters into the bay oppoſite to Newark. There are falls pretty remarkable on this river, at the head of the bay, which many people go to ſee as a curioſity.

There are many other ſmall rivulets, not conſiderable, and many creeks and inlets upon the ſea coaſt, and particularly in the bay and river of Delaware, none of them navigable far into the country.

As to mountains, there is a ridge not very high, but

commonly called Rocky Hill, which croſſes the great road from Philadelphia to New-York, about five miles eaſtward of Princeton and runs from the ſouth-eaſt to the north-weſt, continuing about ten miles in length, paſſing about one mile and a half to the north of Princeton. Though there are no hills properly ſpeaking, there is a continued and gradual aſcent from the Delaware to Princeton, and a gradual deſcent from thence to the eaſtward. There is a great ridge of mountains near and on the boundary between New-Jerſey and New-York, running chiefly from eaſt to weſt.

The trees are very various. As to foreſt trees, there are oaks of various kinds, aſh, maple, birch, cheſnut, walnut, pine, locuſt. The middle and upper parts of the country run much into the ſeveral kinds of oak, and in the lower parts are to be found great quantities of pine and cedar. The mulberry tree thrives in moſt parts of the ſtate; and it ſeems remarkably favorable to fruit trees, particularly apples, pears, cherries and peaches, of all which there is great abundance. The vine grows ſpontaneouſly in many parts, and bears a large blue grape, not unpleaſant to eat.

The produce of the improved farms, is wheat, rye, barley, Indian corn, buckwheat, flax, and hemp. It is uſual for farmers to have a ſmall piece of land in tobacco; but it is only for their own uſe, or that of their ſervants; it is not raiſed in New-Jerſey for ſale. All the garden herbs raiſed in France and England, thrive well in New-Jerſey; ſo probably would vines, if cultivated by perſons who underſtood the buſineſs.

Black cattle are raiſed in New-Jerſey to great advantage—alſo horſes. There is a particular turn in the inhabitants for raiſing fine horſes, from the breed imported from England. There is alſo a large breed of heavy draught horſes, in thoſe parts of the ſtate chiefly inhabited by the low Dutch.

IV. The number of inhabitants in New-Jerſey at preſent, is certainly not leſs than two hundred thouſand. There was an exact liſt of them taken about ten years

ago, which will be procured in a ſhort time. There are negroes, but they are certainly not above one ſeventh or one tenth part of the whole. The negroes are exceedingly well uſed, being fed and clothed as well as any free perſons who live by daily labor.

V. There is no profeſſion of religion which has an excluſive legal eſtabliſhment. Some particular churches have charters of incorporation; and probably they would not be refuſed to a body of any denomination. All profeſſions are tolerated, and all proteſtants are capable of electing and being elected, and indeed have every privilege belonging to citizens.—There are in New-Jerſey, Engliſh preſbyterians, Low Dutch preſbyterians, epiſcopalians, baptiſts, quakers. The two firſt, except the difference of the national connexion of the one with the church of Scotland, and the other with the church of Holland, and the language, are of the ſame principles as to doctrine. They have the ſame worſhip and government, and they are by far the moſt numerous. There is a great majority of the preſent legiſlature of theſe two denominations. Formerly the quakers, though not the majority, had conſiderable influence; but ſince the late conteſt with Great-Britain, they are fewer in number, and altogether without power. The epiſcopalians are few. The baptiſts are preſbyterians in all other reſpects, only differing in the point of infant baptiſm; their political weight goes the ſame way as the preſbyterians; their number is ſmall.

VI. There is at Princeton a college, which had originally a royal charter, begun in 1748. It is now confirmed in its privileges, with ſome alterations and improvements, by act of aſſembly. The charter name of it is, the College of New-Jerſey; the name of the building, Naſſau-Hall. It was in a flouriſhing ſtate before the war, having about one hundred and fifty under graduates and other ſcholars; but was entirely deſolated, and the houſe made a wreck, by the confuſion of the times—firſt by the Engliſh army, which entirely ſcattered the ſcholars, and took poſſeſſion of the houſe; and afterwards, by the Ame-

rican army making it a barrack and hospital. It now begins to recover, having of under graduates and scholars about sixty.—A printed account of the college has been given to Mr. Marbois before.

There is also in New-Jersey a college, whose charter name is Queen's College, set up by the low Dutch, with a particular view to preserve their language, and all the peculiar customs of the church of Holland. They have no building as yet, but have carried on their instruction sometimes at Brunswick, sometimes elsewhere.

The College of New-Jersey is the best building in the state. Neither churches nor court-houses are any where sumptuous. There is no public hospital in the state.

There are few men of letters in the state of New-Jersey, except those who belong to law, physic, or theology; and many of these professions are often taken up without a liberal education. The state consists almost wholly of substantial farmers. There has been formerly known, especially when the quakers had some power, a prejudice against learning—That prejudice begins to wear off.

There are no turnpike roads. There are statutes for the wideness of the public roads; also for repairing, though it is generally poorly done—yet from the climate and the level position of the country, the roads are excellent in summer. The accommodations in taverns are in general as good as in any state in America. The great road from Philadelphia to New-York, lies through the Middle of New-Jersey, by Trenton, Princeton, Brunswick, Woodbridge, Elizabeth-town, and Newark.

VII. I cannot at present recollect any customs peculiar to the state, or that from their singularity deserve notice. New-Jersey was first peopled by the Low Dutch, at least the eastern part of it. Their language is continued there as yet, though wearing out. They are a remarkably cleanly people, and frugal. They use their slaves and other servants with great humanity, often not scrupling white and black to eat together. People from all the other states are continually moving into and out of this state, so that there is little peculiarity of manners.

VIII. *The present state of manufactures, commerce, and exterior trade.*

New-Jersey being in general settled by farmers, with a great equality of rank and even possessions, no considerable manufactures are established in it. There are, however, tradesmen dispersed through it, of almost every kind. The farmers being frugal and plain in their manners, always made both linen and woolen cloth for their own families and their servants. They have given greater attention to this matter within these five or six years that the differences with Great-Britain have subsisted. I believe it may be depended upon, that there is not one in ten of the members of the legislature of New-Jersey, who is not clothed in the manufacture of his own family for the greatest part, and many of them have no other clothing of any kind. At this time a great quantity of very good cloth is made in the families. Some tradesmen in different places make for sale, but not much. There are some very considerable dealers in leather, and still a greater number in hats. All iron tools are well made here, but not for exportation out of the state.

From the situation of New-Jersey, there is hardly any foreign trade carried on directly from it. The merchants in Trenton, Brunswick, Burdentown, and several other places, have boats, shallops, and other small vessels, with which they trade to Philadelphia or New-York. In former times ships might be entered both at Burlington and Amboy, for any part of the world: but few are sent abroad—such of our merchants as are concerned in foreign trade, being almost always joined in company with some of the large cities above mentioned.

IX. *A notice of the best sea-ports in the state, and how big are the vessels they can receive.*

The best sea-port in the state of New-Jersey is Amboy, which can receive vessels of as great burden as New-York. There has never been as yet any great foreign trade at Amboy. The vicinity of New-York has probably been a hindrance to it. There are harbors at little Egg-harbor and great Egg-harbor, on the coast of the Atlantic, which

privateers and traders have made a considerable use of since the war. They cannot receive vessels of great burden; but the greatest part of the trading vessels can go in there. The same is the case with the creeks on the Jersey shore, in the river Delaware.

X. *A notice of the commercial productions peculiar to that state, and of those objects which the inhabitants are obliged to draw from Europe and from other parts of the world.*

The productions of New-Jersey, and the sources of its wealth, are grain of every kind, as mentioned under question third—horses, cattle, salted beef and pork, and poultry. In times of peace, great quantities of all these are are sent to the West-Indies, and flax-seed to Europe, shipped however more commonly in Philadelphia or New-York than any port in New-Jersey. The city of Philadelphia receives a great proportion of its provisions, including vegetables of every kind, from New-Jersey. The soil of that part of New-Jersey which is opposite to Philadelphia, is exceedingly proper for gardening, and derives much of its value from its proximity to that city.

The state of New-Jersey is obliged to draw from Europe and other parts, tea, sugar, wine, spirits. Before the war they purchased considerable quantities of English cloth, both linen and woolen, because cheaper than they could manufacture it in many instances, and because many tradesmen and others had not the materials of manufacture. All articles of finery they must purchase if they use them—lawns, gauzes, silks and velvet.

XI. *The weights, measures, and the currency of hard money—Some details relating to the exchange with Europe.*

The weights and measures now used in New-Jersey, are the same as in England, of every kind—measures of length, solidity, superficies, dry and liquid. The most common for grain is the bushel, which contains eight Winchester gallons, and each gallon two hundred and seventy-two and a quarter solid inches.

The exchange between New-Jerſey and Europe, is carried on almoſt wholly through Philadelphia and New-York.

The ſtatute currency of money in New-Jerſey is in the ſame proportion to ſterling as that of Pennſylvania, that is, as five to three. A Spaniſh milled dollar is, of New-Jerſey proclamation money, ſeven ſhillings and ſix pence. There was twenty years ago, a currency or way of reckoning in New-Jerſey, commonly called light money, according to which a dollar was eight ſhillings and eight pence, but this ſeems now to be wholly diſuſed, or confined only to the north-eaſtern part of the ſtate. The other way of reckoning is called *proclamation money*, which prevails.

XII. *The public income and expenses.*

The public income of New-Jerſey conſiſts, ſo far as is known to me, of taxes annually laid by the aſſemblies; and is great or ſmall, as they ſhall think the exigencies of the ſtate require. There is in general a great diſpoſition to ſave the public money; indeed ſuch as in many inſtances to make inadequate proviſion. The ſalary of the governor was by the act of ſupply, October 1775, before the change from a colony to a free ſtate, twelve hundred pounds, proclamation money; the judges of the ſupreme court, three in number, had each of them one hundred and fifty the ſame year; all other expenſes for clerks, &c. were ſmall; and the members of council and aſſembly had each eight ſhillings for every day's attendance. The delegates in congreſs had at firſt twenty ſhillings per day; and during the depreciation of the money, if they made any allowance at the beginning of the year becauſe of its bad ſtate then, they never made any amends for the increaſed depreciation before the year expired.—As to this and all ſuch matters, they may be ſeen more fully from the printed laws, which I believe may be purchaſed of Iſaac Collins, printer to the ſtate, in Trenton.

XIII. *The measures taken with regard to the estates and possessions of the rebels, commonly called tories.*

They have been all sold off *in perpetuum*, and are now in possession of the new proprietors; the debts upon them to faithful subjects, having been first discharged.

XIV. *The marine and navigation.*

There are no vessels whatever belonging to the state of New-Jersey. There are privateers who have commissions, which sail from the ports on the coast, or on the enemy's lines. There is an admiralty court established for the condemnation of prizes.—As to merchant ships, see the answer to question eighth.

XV. *A notice of the mines, and other subterranean riches.*

There are some very valuable iron mines in New-Jersey, in Morris and Suffex counties. Some companies in England were concerned in working some of these mines before the war. It was suspected some years ago, that there were copper mines in New-Jersey; but no trial hitherto made has fully succeeded—some gentlemen lost their fortunes in the attempt.

It is not known whether there are any coal mines or not, as people every where burn wood.

XVI. *Some samples of the mines, and of the extraordinary stones; in short, a notice of all that can increase the progress of human knowledge.*

Iron ore is so very common, that it cannot be supposed to be an object of curiosity. I have heard of and seen some pieces of black matter, that was said, when dissolved in water, to be exceedingly good ink. If this or any other curiosity can be obtained by enquiry, they shall be forwarded.—There is very good marl in some parts of New-Jersey, to the eastward.—There is no limestone in the parts of New-Jersey where I have been, but probably there is some in Suffex.—There are in several places of New-Jersey, sugar-maple trees, whence the country people draw sugar for their own use, as in the back parts of New-Hampshire and Vermont.

XVII. *A description of the Indians established in the states, before the European settlements, and of those who are still remaining. An indication of the Indian monuments discovered in that state.*

The Indians and their manner of life, are described in several books, much better than I can do it, who was never among them. And indeed by comparing together all that I have ever heard or read, it appears that the characteristic features of the Indians of North-America, are the same which have distinguished savages in all parts of the world, and wherever discovered—gravity and sullenness of deportment, love of hunting and war—that is to say, depredation; ferocity to their captives, laziness and aversion to habitual labor, tyranny over the female sex, passive courage, and, if it may be called so, active cowardice, and strong passions both of lasting gratitude and unextinguishable resentment.

The chief thing that a philosopher can learn from the Indians in New-Jersey is, that perhaps the most complete experiment has been made here how they would agree with cultivated life. At the time when the Indians sold and confirmed the lands to the settlers, at their own request, a tract of land was purchased for them to live in the heart of the colony, in Burlington county, of three thousand acres and more, which was secured to them by law. They had a village built, and a house of worship and a minister, and every possible encouragement given them to cultivate the land, and carry on trades; yet, after all, they were so far from increasing in numbers or improving in industry, that at different times several of them went back into the woods, and the remainder dwindled away, so that there are few of them now left. On the whole it does not appear, that either by our people going among them, or by their being brought among us, that it is possible to give them a relish of civilized life. There have been some of them educated at this college, as well as in New-England; but seldom or never did they prove either good or useful. — — —

A FEW

REFLECTIONS

Humbly submitted to the Consideration of the Public in general, and in particular to the Congress of the United States.

THOUGH the following reflections come from an individual citizen, no way connected with public buſineſs, I hope they will be read with candor and attention. All good conduct proceeds from certain radical principles; and retired theoretical perſons certainly may judge as well, perhaps they often judge better, of thoſe, than ſuch as are engaged in the buſtle and hurry of an active life, or occupied in the management of particular affairs. Another circumſtance which encourages me in this hope is, that I intend to offer nothing but what ſhall be even beyond the imputation of proceeding, either from party attachment or mercenary views.

When the Federal conſtitution was agreed on, it was the fervent deſire, and I may ſay the earneſt prayer of many, that it might take place, and get into operation with quietneſs, and under the acquieſcence and approbation of the public. This I think we may ſay, has happily been the caſe ſo far as we have yet proceeded. The perſons choſen to fill the houſes of Congreſs, have been generally approved. Perhaps ſome ſtates, in a few inſtances, might have made a better choice; but upon the whole, there is

little reaſon to complain. I remember to have heard a gentleman well acquainted with the ſubject, ſay of the former Congreſs which conducted the war, that he had never known a time in which it did not contain a great plurality of men of integrity, and of thoſe a very reſpectable number of diſtinguiſhed abilities. I hope and believe that this is the caſe at preſent; and may it always continue to be ſo.

The meaſures taken by Congreſs in their laſt ſeſſion, have in general given ſatisfaction. I am not ignorant that there have been ſome ſevere, and in my opinion petulant and inſolent remarks made upon the ſalaries fixed for public officers, and the compenſation allowed for the attendance of members of Congreſs, eſpecially the laſt. I am of opinion, however, that they are both reaſonable, and the laſt at leaſt as reaſonable, if not more ſo, than the firſt. I hope few perſons will ever be in Congreſs, who, devoting their time to the public ſervice, may not well deſerve the compenſation fixed for them, from their character and talents. And if they have lucrative profeſſions, or valuable private fortunes, theſe muſt be deſerted for a time, and probably a loſs incurred greater than the whole wages. I ſhould alſo be ſorry to hear of any member of Congreſs who became rich by the ſavings above his expenſe. I know very well, that there have been Congreſs men and aſſembly men too, who have carried home conſiderable ſums from leſs wages; but they were ſuch generally as did more good to their families by their penury, than to their country by their political wiſdom.

I come now to what I chiefly intended by this ſhort eſſay. Much time of the laſt ſeſſion was ſpent in debates upon fixing a place for the permanent reſidence of Congreſs, and building a federal city. That matter was under the conſideration of the former Congreſs, and was fixed and unfixed I believe more than once. It always occaſioned great altercation; nor was it poſſible to tell when it was ſettled; for whenever Congreſs changed its members, or the members changed their opinions, every thing that had been done was undone. In the laſt meeting of the federal Congreſs, it ſeems to have been finally deci-

ded; but, either by accident or the addreſs of ſome who were oppoſed to the deciſion, it was thrown open again, and is now left as unſettled as ever. I have not met with any body who was ſorry, but with many who were happy at this circumſtance; and I ſincerely wiſh that it may be ſuffered to ſleep in its preſent ſituation at leaſt for a conſiderable time, and till ſome other buſineſs of greater and more confeſſed importance ſhall be completely finiſhed. I am now to give my reaſons for this opinion.

1. A determination upon that ſubject is not *necessary*. When I ſay it is not neceſſary, I mean that we are not urged to it by any preſſing inconveniencies or injuries which we have ſuffered or are ſuffering for want of it. Every body muſt own that it would be very expenſive; and indeed I am one myſelf, who, if it were to be done at all, and there were buildings to be erected which ſhould not belong to any ſtate, but to the union, would wiſh that they ſhould be not barely elegant, but magnificent, that they might not derogate from the dignity of the empire. This is not even contrary to the general principle of economy; for it has been obſerved that ſome of the moſt frugal nations have been moſt ſumptuous in their public edifices, of which the ſtadthouſe at Amſterdam is an example. Therefore, if the neceſſity were great, if the public buſineſs could not be carried on, nor the public authority maintained without it, I ſhould be for ſubmitting to every inconvenience—I would not be deterred even by the expenſe itſelf. But is this really the caſe? Does it appear to be neceſſary from the nature of the thing? No. The weight and influence of any deliberative or legiſlative body, depend much more on the wiſdom of their meaſures, than the ſplendid apartments in which they are aſſembled. Does it appear to be neceſſary from experience or the example of other nations? I think not. I can hardly recollect above one or two of the kingdoms or ſtates of Europe, in which the capital is central; and as to confederated republics, ſome of them have no common capital at all. The Swiſs Cantons have no federal city. The different ſtates of which this laſt conſiſts, have for ages, when they had occaſion to meet for common conſultation,

held their Diets in different places. But we need go no further than our own experience. Did not the former Congreſs carry on the war with Great-Britain, defend and ſecure the liberties of the United States, without a federal city? Was the want of it greatly or deeply felt as an inconvenience? I do not recollect a ſingle complaint made in ſpeech or writing upon the ſubject.

2. It can be but little *profitable*. The truth is, when I attempt to recollect and enumerate the advantages to be derived from a federal city, in a central place, yet thinly inhabited, I find them very few and very ſmall. If the American empire come to be one conſolidated government, I grant it would be of ſome conſequence that the ſeat of that government and ſource of authority ſhould not be too diſtant from the extremities, for reaſons which I need not here mention. But if the particular ſtates are to be preſerved and ſupported in their conſtitutional government, it ſeems of very little conſequence where the Congreſs, conſiſting of repreſentatives from theſe ſtates, ſhall hold their ſeſſions. There is not only little profit in their being fixed and central, but perhaps ſome advantages might ariſe from their being unfixed and ambulatory. This laſt ſeems to be more ſuitable to the equality of rights of the ſeveral ſtates. It is far from being an impoſſible ſuppoſition, that the ſtate on which Congreſs ſhould be fixed, would think itſelf entitled to a leading, if not a domineering influence over the other ſtates. As to eaſineſs of acceſs, ſuch is the ſtate of this country, lying along the ſea coaſt, and having ſo many navigable rivers, that any city whatever on the coaſt or great rivers is eaſily acceſſible; and the difference of diſtance, eſpecially when the payment is to be in proportion to the diſtance, is not worth mentioning. It is farther to be obſerved, that though buildings may be immediately raiſed for the accommodation of Congreſs, yet a great city, or a city of opulence and commerce, could not be raiſed for a long tract of time. It is even uncertain whether the bare reſidence of Congreſs during their annual ſeſſions (which it is to be hoped in a few years will be but ſhort) independent of other circumſtances, will ever raiſe a great commercial city at all. The Hague,

though the reſidence of the ſtadtholder, is far from being the largeſt, moſt populous, or moſt wealthy city in Holland. Now I humbly conceive, that if not reſidence in, yet nearneſs to ſome important commercial city or cities, will be found to be abſolutely neceſſary for tranſactions relating to money or finance: ſo that, if the advantages and diſadvantages of a federal city on the propoſed plan are fairly weighed, the latter would preponderate.

3. There is reaſon to fear that it may be very hurtful. Nothing is of ſo much conſequence to us at preſent as union; and nothing is ſo much the deſire of all unprejudiced, public-ſpirited and virtuous men. The federal conſtitution is but new. It is, we hope, taking place; but cannot yet be ſaid to have taken root. It will, from the nature of things, take ſome time before it can acquire the reſpect and veneration neceſſary in every government from the body of the people, who are always guided by feeling and habit, more than by a train of reaſoning, however concluſive. Now, is there no reaſon to fear that the diſputes upon this ſubject may produce warmth and violence, and perhaps an alienation of mind in ſome ſtates againſt others, very prejudicial to public order? The moſt trifling ſubjects of diſpute have ſometimes created diviſions both in larger and ſmaller political bodies, which have ended in common ruin. If I am rightly informed, the diſputes which have already taken place in Congreſs upon this ſubject, have been carried on with greater virulence of temper and acrimony of expreſſion, than upon any other that has been under their deliberation. This is not to be wondered at; for it is indeed of ſuch a nature, that it has a nearer relation to ſtate attachments and local prejudices than any other that can be named. Perhaps in ſuch a queſtion it is lawful, decent, and even neceſſary, to plead the local intereſt of particular ſtates; and therefore it is to be expected that every delegate will contend with earneſtneſs for that of his own. At any rate, whatever oſtenſible public reaſons may be deviſed by a fertile invention, all unprejudiced hearers will believe that it is local attachment that guides their judgment, and inflames their

zeal. The only uſe that it is neceſſary for me to make of ſuch a remark, is to ſhew that the contention and animoſity raiſed by this diſpute will probably extend itſelf to every other, and that it will not be confined to the contending members in Congreſs, but will ſpread itſelf through all the ſtates, whoſe cauſe they plead, and whoſe intereſt they ſeem to eſpouſe. This is one of thoſe queſtions that had much better be decided wrong by general conſent, than decided right by a ſmall majority, without convincing or ſatisfying the opponents.

4. In the laſt place, it is certainly at leaſt *unseasonable.* Though it were poſſible juſtly to anſwer all the objections I have ſtated above, I muſt ſtill ſay, there is a time for every thing under the ſun. A meaſure may be good in itſelf, and even neceſſary in a qualified ſenſe, yet if there be another duty incumbent upon the ſame body, that is better and more neceſſary, this ſurely ought to have the precedence in point of time. Now, I think it cannot be denied, and all intelligent perſons in the United States ſeem to be of opinion, that bringing order into our finances, reſtoring and eſtabliſhing public credit, is the moſt important buſineſs which the Congreſs has to do. It is alſo the moſt urgent in point of time; becauſe in the interval, many public creditors are in a ſituation truly deplorable, whereas I can think of nobody that is ſuffering much for want of a federal city. The two deſigns are alſo connected together as cauſe and effect; and I need not tell any body which of theſe ought to go foremoſt. What a romantic project will it be to fix on a ſituation, and to form plans for building a number of palaces, before we provide money to build them with, or even before we pay thoſe debts which we have already contracted? This is a matter in which not only all the citizens of America, thoſe who are, and thoſe who are not, public creditors, are deeply concerned, but on which will depend our future ſecurity, our intereſt and influence among foreign nations, and even the opinion that ſhall be formed of us by poſterity itſelf.

Theſe few reflections, not enlarged upon as they might eaſily have been, nor ſwelled or exaggerated by

pompous declamation, but ſimply and nakedly propoſed,—I leave to the judgment of the impartial public; and remain,

Their moſt obedient,

Humble ſervant,

X. Y.

ON THE

GEORGIA

CONSTITUTION.

SIR,

IN your paper of Saturday laſt, you have given us the new Conſtitution of Georgia, in which I find the following reſolution, "No clergyman of any denomination ſhall be a member of the General Aſſembly." I would be very well ſatisfied that ſome of the gentlemen who have made that an eſſential article of this conſtitution, or who have inſerted and approve it in other conſtitutions, would be pleaſed to explain a little the principles, as well as to aſcertain the meaning of it.

Perhaps we underſtand pretty generally, what is meant by a clergyman, viz. a perſon regularly called and ſet apart to the miniſtry of the goſpel, and authoriſed to preach and adminiſter the ſacraments of the Chriſtian religion. Now ſuffer me to aſk this queſtion; Before any man among us was ordained a miniſter, was he not a citizen of the United States, and if being in Georgia, a citizen of the ſtate of Georgia? Had he not then a right to be elected a member of the aſſembly, if qualified in point of property? How then has he loſt, or why is he deprived of this right? Is it by offence or diſqualification? Is it a ſin againſt the public to become a miniſter? Does it merit that the perſon who is guilty of it ſhould be immediately deprived

of one of his moſt important rights as a citizen? Is not this inflicting a penalty which always ſuppoſes an offence? Is a miniſter then diſqualified for the office of a ſenator or repreſentative? Does this calling and profeſſion render him ſtupid or ignorant? I am inclined to form a very high opinion of the natural underſtanding of the freemen and freeholders of the ſtate of Georgia, as well as of their improvement and culture by education, and yet I am not able to conceive, but that ſome of thoſe equally qualified, may enter into the clerical order: and then it muſt not be unfitneſs, but ſome other reaſon that produces the excluſion. Perhaps it may be thought that they are excluded from civil authority, that they may be more fully and conſtantly employed in their ſpiritual functions. If this had been the ground of it, how much more properly would it have appeared, as an order of an eccleſiaſtical body with reſpect to their own members. In that caſe I ſhould not only have forgiven, but approved and juſtified it; but in the way in which it now ſtands, it is evidently a puniſhment by loſs of privilege, inflicted on thoſe who go into the office of the miniſtry; for which, perhaps, the gentlemen of Georgia may have good reaſons, though I have not been able to diſcover them.

But beſides the uncertainty of the principle on which this reſolution is founded, there ſeems to me much uncertainty as to the meaning of it. How are we to determine who is or is not a clergyman? Is he only a clergyman who has received ordination from thoſe who have derived the right by an uninterrupted ſucceſſion from the apoſtles? Or is he alſo a clergyman, who is ſet apart by the impoſition of hands of a body of other clergyman, by joint authority? Or is he alſo a clergyman who is ſet apart by the church members of his own ſociety, without any impoſition of hands at all? Or is he alſo a clergyman who has exhorted in a methodiſt ſociety, or ſpoken in a quaker meeting, or any other religious aſſembly met for public worſhip? There are ſtill greater difficulties behind:—Is the clerical character indelible? There are ſome who have been ordained who occaſionally perform ſome clerical functions, but have no paſtoral charge at all. There are

ſome who finding public ſpeaking injurious to health, or from other reaſons eaſily conceived, have reſigned their paſtoral charge, and wholly diſcontinued all acts and exerciſes of that kind; and there are ſome, particularly in New-England, who having exerciſed the clerical office ſome time, and finding it leſs ſuitable to their talents than they apprehend, have voluntarily relinquiſhed it, and taken to ſome other profeſſion, as law, phyſic, or merchandize—Do theſe all continue clergymen, or do they ceaſe to be clergymen, and by that ceſſation return to, or recover the honorable privileges of laymen?

I cannot help thinking that theſe difficulties are very conſiderable, and may occaſion much litigation, if the article of the conſtitution ſtands in the looſe, ambiguous form in which it now appears; and therefore I would recommend the following alterations, which I think will make every thing definite and unexceptionable.

"No clergyman, of any denomination, ſhall be capable of being elected a member of the Senate or Houſe of Repreſentatives, becauſe [here inſert the grounds of offenſive diſqualification, which I have not been able to diſcover] Provided always, and it is the true intent and meaning of this part of the conſtitution, that if at any time he ſhall be completely deprived of the clerical character by thoſe by whom he was inveſted with it, as by depoſition for curſing and ſwearing, drunkenneſs or uncleanneſs, he ſhall then be fully reſtored to all the privileges of a free citizen; his offence ſhall no more be remembered againſt him; but he may be choſen either to the Senate or Houſe of Repreſentatives, and ſhall be treated with all the reſpect due to his *brethren*, the other members of Aſſembly.

THE

DRUID,

Originally Published in Numbers Periodically.

NUMBER I.

SIR,

IT is my intention, by your permiſſion and aſſiſtance to attempt the inſtruction and entertainment of the public once a month, on miſcellaneous ſubjects. This letter ſhall ſerve as the firſt paper, and ſhall be an introduction to thoſe that are to follow, by pointing out the ſpirit and deſign of the undertaking, and the plan upon which it is to be conducted.

The title which I have aſſumed, was not intended to carry any wit in it, and indeed not much meaning, further than what is common to all names, the diſtinction of one thing or perſon from another. It proved a matter of no little difficulty to fix upon a title, after ſo great a variety as the world has ſeen, ſince the practice of periodical eſſays was firſt introduced. After a good deal of deliberation on a matter of very little moment, the above was ſuggeſted, by the place which is now, and is likely to be, my reſidence, while I continue on earth.

It is a ſmall but neat houſe, in a pleaſant, retired ſituation, ſurrounded with woods, in all the ſimple majeſty of their uncultivated ſtate. Neither was it unſuitable to my time of life, the age of fifty, a cool and contemplative ſeaſon, when men of education or buſineſs have generally ſeen as much of the world as ſatisfies their curioſity, and enables them to underſtand well enough what is paſſing in it; ſo that they have neither neceſſity nor inclination to mix again in its active ſcenes.

I was born and educated in Great-Britain, and had all the advantage I could receive from a long reſidence in one of the moſt celebrated ſeats of learning in that happy kingdom. The prime and vigor of life I ſpent in the midſt of public buſineſs, and had a thorough knowledge of the greateſt part, and perſonal intimacy with not a few, of the perſons moſt diſtinguiſhed in rank, politics, or literature, for the laſt thirty years. From what circumſtances, or with what views, I came into this country, it is of no conſequence for the reader to know; ſuffice it therefore to ſay, that I was not tranſported by Sir John Fielding, but came of my own proper motion and free choice; and indeed have never met with any thing in paſſing through life, that could be ſuppoſed either to ſour the temper, or break the vigor of the mind. There are not a few who, towards the cloſe of life, acquire a ſettled hatred or contempt of mankind, and ſeem diſpoſed to avenge their own real or ſuppoſed calamities on the world in general, by the acrimony of their converſation, and the virulent ſatire of their writings. Productions dictated by ſuch a ſpirit, have often, it muſt be owned, ſuch a poignant ſeverity, as deeply wounds the object of their reſentment, and yet, I think, ſeldom adds to the reliſh of thoſe for whom the entertainment is provided.

It has been generally ſuppoſed, that ſatire and invective is the way of writing, of all others, moſt agreeable to the public; and the reaſon given for it is very little to the credit of human nature, viz. The prevalence of envy and malignity in the bulk of mankind. Had I been of this opinion, I would have cautiouſly avoided introducing

the ſentiment, at leaſt ſo ſoon, as it would have been but a poor compliment to that very public, whoſe attention I mean to ſolicit, and whoſe improvement I wiſh to promote. I confeſs that a thorough knowledge of the world, and extenſive reading in hiſtory, have often produced mean thoughts of human nature. We ſee ſometimes old hackneyed politicians diſcover a jealouſy of the characters, and an indifference to the ſufferings of others, which ſurpriſes and offends men of leſs experience, who are therefore often laughed at for their weakneſs. This, in ſome inſtances is the miſtake of the obſerver, while the coolneſs and compoſure of ſpirit, the deliberate and ſelf-collected carriage, which is the effect of time, is falſely called a callous or unfeeling diſpoſition. But where the remark is juſt, and a real and general hatred of others has obtained full dominion, it would not be ſo decent to infer from it, that mankind are univerſally worthleſs or incorrigible, as to impute it to the ſelfiſh meanneſs of that heart in which it had taken place.

It is very common for authors to go to an extreme on the one hand or on the other, in ſpeaking of human nature. Thoſe philoſophers who ſpeak of it in ſuch exalted terms as to contradict the truths of religion, have preſent experience and the hiſtory of paſt ages directly againſt them. The moſt illuſtrious perſons in the records of time, have derived the greateſt part of their luſtre itſelf, either from the ſingularity of their character, or, which is nearly the ſame thing, from the depravity of others, who needed their aſſiſtance for inſtruction or correction. It was ſmartly, at leaſt, if not juſtly ſaid, by an author not many years ago, that the wiſdom of legiſlators, and the admirable policy of ſtates, and even the purity moral precepts, are juſt ſuch arguments for the dignity of human nature as gibbets are. There is, doubtleſs, no ſmall degree of error, ignorance, predjudice and corruption to be found among men ; but theſe, when properly viewed, ſerve rather to demonſtrate the importance and neceſſity of information and inſtruction. There are not only particular inſtances in which the human mind has diſcovered the moſt exalted virtue as well as amazing pow-

ers, but the human race in general, with all its defects, is certainly the nobleſt and moſt valuable in this lower world, and therefore the moſt worthy of cultivation. To this may be added, that there is no circumſtance in which there is a more manifeſt diſtinction between man and the inferior creatures, than that the individual is more helpleſs as well as the kind more noble; and therefore the intercourſe of ſociety and mutual aſſiſtance is abſolutely neceſſary to his improvement and perfection.

But this is perhaps treating the ſubject in too abſtract and philoſophical a manner, which I well know is not much to the taſte of the preſent age. The importance of knowledge, and the power of intellectual light, will be readily confeſſed. The queſtions to be ſeriouſly debated with himſelf by an author, at his firſt ſetting out, are, What encouragement he has to devote himſelf to the public ſervice? and, what reaſon to think he hath any thing to communicate that is worthy of the public attention? Now, as to the *firſt* of theſe, it is my opinion, that though error, prejudice, and partiality, are very univerſal, that is to ſay, they have place in ſome degree in many perſons of every rank, age, and country; yet their influence in each has, properly ſpeaking, but a narrow ſphere. Truth is much ſtronger than them all. They ſhew themſelves chiefly in the ſmaller intereſts of particulars; but there is a candor and impartiality in a diffuſive public, which may be in a great meaſure depended upon, and which will both hear truth and obey it. There is not perhaps a man in that public, but has many prejudices and prepoſſeſſions; but theſe are confined within certain bounds, like the ſphere of attraction of particular bodies, round himſelf: when you go beyond that ſphere, they are not felt, or they are felt very weakly. There is an obſervation I have ſometimes made, which I do not remember to have read in any author, but which, if juſt, ſhould teach every man to revere the public judgment. The remark is, that I can ſcarcely recollect any perſon well and intimately known to me, whoſe performances, either in ſpeaking or writing, had been exhibited to the world for any time, of whoſe talents and erudition the great plu-

rality did not judge exactly in the same manner that I did myself. If they do justice to every other person, why should I doubt their doing it to me? Ignorance, prejudice, malice, or accident, may have some influence at first; but their effects are merely temporary, and are speedily effaced. Time is a diligent enquirer, and a just judge. I could almost say the same thing of a man's moral character, under two exceptions: If you go beyond the bounds of local politics, and abstract entirely from religious differences, every man is spoken of pretty nearly as he deserves. I am sufficiently aware that there are particular exceptions to this general theory, but I have not now time to enter upon them; and therefore shall leave them till they fall in my way in the discussion of such subjects as shall be undertaken in my future papers.

As to the *second* point, whether I have any thing to communicate that is worthy of the public attention? It is plain from the appearance of this paper, that I have already judged of it so far as to make the attempt; it is therefore too late for me, and too early for the reader, to take that matter into consideration. I shall, however, mention briefly the plan which I mean to follow. The general subject of these papers shall be the philosophy of human nature and of human life; I would willingly join science and reflection to experience and observation. Literature and morals, arts and industry, shall be my chief themes; and under one or other of these, every thing may be introduced, that can in the least contribute to the happiness of social or private life. I must beg the reader to observe, that in handling all these subjects, I shall have a particular view to the state and interest of this rising country. As in youth the human frame wears its loveliest form; as the spring is the most charming season of the revolving year: so, a country newly planted, and every day advancing to a maturer state, affords the highest delight to a contemplative philosopher, and is, at the same time, the strongest invitation to activity and usefulness.

I am sensible that some will think the present an improper season for beginning on so extensive a plan. They will say the time calls not for speculation but action. Our in-

duſtry is now all turned into one channel, the vigorous exertion of the ſpirit of defence. When liberty, property and life are at ſtake, we muſt not think of being ſcholars, but ſoldiers. When happy peace returns we ſhall be able to apply with proper attention and vigor to the improvement of our minds, as well as to the cultivation of the ſoil: till then we have other work upon our hands. I muſt inform the reader that theſe are miſtaken reflections. There is ſuch a connexion among all the arts that improve or embelliſh human nature, that they are beſt promoted in conjunction, and generally go in a body. As I look without ſolicitude, or rather with unſhaken confidence of ſucceſs, on the preſent glorious and important ſtruggle for the liberties of mankind; ſo I conſider it as a proper ſeaſon for the moſt ardent application to the improvement of this country in all reſpects. In times of public commotion the human mind is rouſed, and ſhakes off the incumbrances of ſloth and ſelf-indulgence. Thoſe who put on the harneſs and go into the field, muſt be encouraged, aſſiſted, and even ſupported, by the activity and induſtry of thoſe who remain at home. Beſides, I am much miſtaken if the time is not juſt at hand, when there ſhall be greater need than ever in America, for the moſt accurate diſcuſſion of the principles of ſociety, the rights of nations, and the policy of ſtates; all which ſhall have a place in the ſubſequent numbers of this paper. But above all, can it ever be unſeaſonable to lay before the public what tends to improve the temper and morals of the reader, which ſhall be the ultimate object of all my diſquiſitions? He who makes a people *virtuous*, makes them *invincible*.

The reader will now, in ſome degree, underſtand the deſign and extent of this undertaking. As to wit and humor, I chooſe to make no promiſes upon that head, leſt I ſhould break them. Moſt people, perhaps, differ from me; but I confeſs I would rather read a tedious argument than a dull joke. Yet the favors of the ingenious, as the ſaying is (poſt paid) may perhaps enable me ſometimes to gratify a reader of taſte; only I muſt take the liberty of being pleaſed myſelf firſt, other-

wife they ſhall ſleep with me, or return to the authors. Some, perhaps, will wonder that I have ſaid nothing of the delightful themes of love and gallantry, eſpecially as it is ſo eaſy to eſtabliſh a connexion between the tender paſſion and military glory. The younger claſs of my readers may reſt ſatisfied that they ſhall not want good advice enough, which may be applied to that and to every other ſubject; but I do not take myſelf to be qualified to paint the ardors of a glowing flame. I have not ſeen any killing eyes theſe ſeveral years. It was but yeſterday, that I ſmiled involuntarily on reading a poem in your laſt magazine, ſetting forth, that both Beauty and Wiſdom had taken up their reſidence with a certain nymph, the one in her cheek, the other in her tongue, and that they were reſolved never to depart; which I thought was a little unfortunate for all the reſt of the ſex. I wiſh every Strephon and Daphne heartily well, and that the exalted and rapturous phraſes of Arcadia may be ſoon brought down to the compoſed diſcourſe of a quiet man and wife in Philadelphia; in which character, perhaps they may ſometimes hear from me, I hope, to their great benefit.

I am, Sir,

Your moſt obedient ſervant,

THE DRUID.

NUMBER II.

SIR,

WHEN I firſt came into this country, nothing was farther from my expectation than the conteſt that has now taken place between Great-Britain and the Colonies. The reader, I ſuppoſe, will alſo readily believe me when I affirm, that what relates to this im-

portant ſtruggle, made but a ſmall part of the matter I had meditated and digeſted for the ſubject of theſe diſſertations. But, from ſome letters which I have received, and much converſation that I have heard, it appears plain, that ſomething of this kind is expected from me, and that if it is long withheld, it will be difficult to avoid ſuſpicion from the warmer ſons of liberty. It is not eaſy to determine what branches of this great argument it would be beſt to take up, as moſt ſuitable to a ſpeculative philoſopher, and at the ſame time moſt neceſſary or uſeful to the bulk of my readers. The natural rights of mankind, and the cauſe of liberty in general, have been explained and defended in innumerable treatiſes, ancient and modern. The application of theſe principles to the American controverſy, has been made by many writers among us, with the greateſt clearneſs and preciſion. The nature of government, and method of balancing a civil conſtitution, I cannot ſay has been handled either with ſo much fulneſs or propriety as the other topics; yet on this alſo many excellent obſervations have been made. If it has not been much reaſoned on, it ſeems nevertheleſs to be both felt and underſtood, in almoſt every corner of this continent.

Leaving, therefore, theſe ſubjects for the preſent, as we are yet engaged in a war ſomewhat ſingular in its nature, important in its conſequences, and uncertain in its duration, I ſhall beg leave to make ſome remarks as a ſcholar, and as a citizen of the world, on *the manner of carrying on war*. By this is not meant, to lay down a plan of diſcipline, or tactics for an army, or of ſtratagems and manœuvres for a general or inferior leader; but to conſider by what means wars of different kinds may be carried on, conſiſtently with reaſon, conſcience, or common utility. Every body muſt have obſerved how frequently the newſpapers have been filled with complaints of our enemies, as acting ſavagely and barbarouſly—as being guilty of unnatural cruelty—as carrying on a felonious and piratical war—as acting contrary to the laws of war. I have, however, taken notice, that among all theſe diſſertations little or nothing has been ſaid to ſhew

why they have acted barbarously, further than that they have acted unjustly in being our enemies at all. No one has told us what are the laws of war, or endeavored to make us understand when enemies may be said to act a fair and honourable, and when a dastardly and cruel part.

This subject I shall now therefore enter upon; and will endeavor to handle it with as much simplicity as possible, that it may be useful to persons of the lowest rank, and most common understanding. Let me trace it to its source. Wherever society exists founded upon clear established laws, this obliges us to form an idea of a state previous to the formation of society, or before such, or any laws, were made and acknowledged to be in force. This is called a state of nature. I do not enter into the innumerable questions upon this subject; as, how long it could continue, when men increased in number? Whether it is a state of war or peace? Whether inclination prompted, or necessity compelled, men to enter into society? It is sufficient for my purpose, to observe, that independent nations are in a state of natural liberty with respect to one another, or as man to man previous to the social compact. When they disagree, they have no common umpire or judge to resort to, but must decide their quarrels by the sword. The questions then to be resolved are three: 1. Are there any laws at all by which they are bound? or, are all kinds of force or violence equally just? 2. If not, what is the law? what is it that makes the distinction? and, 3. what is the sanction of the law? To whom shall we complain when it is broken?

If there is any such law, it is certainly very justly denominated, by civilians, *the law of nature and nations.* Of nature, because its principles are to be derived from the state of natural or universal liberty, and personal independence; and of nations, because there is no person in such a state at present, excepting nations or large bodies, who consider themselves as independent of each other. Now, that there is such a law, I think is evident, not only from the universal acknowledgment of men, and the practice of nations from the earliest ages, but from

the nature of the thing. If there are any duties binding upon men to each other, in a ſtate of natural liberty, the ſame are due from nation to nation. Bodies politic do not in this circumſtance, differ from individuals. The ſame anſwer muſt be made to the ſecond queſtion. It is impoſſible to mention any right that an individual may juſtly claim, either as to perſon or property, from his fellow men, but a ſociety has the like claim upon any other ſociety. Their perſons muſt not be aſſaulted, nor their property invaded. The ſingle purpoſe of ſociety, indeed, is to protect the individual, and to give him the ſtrength of the public arm, in defence of his juſt and natural right.

But it will be aſked, in the third place, What is the ſanction of this law? and who is to call the offender to account? To this I anſwer, That the ſanction of the law of nature is nothing elſe but a ſenſe of duty, and accountableneſs to the ſupreme Judge; to which may be added, ſuch a ſenſe of general utility, as makes men fear, that if they notoriouſly trample upon it, reproach and infamy among all nations will be the effect, and probably reſentment and indignation by common conſent. Agreeably to this, having recourſe to force is often called an appeal to Heaven, and it is, at the ſame time, generally accompanied with an attempt, by ſome public declaration, to convince other nations of the juſtice of the cauſe.

Omitting many things that are not connected with the point I have in view, particularly without enumerating the legitimate cauſes of war, but ſuppoſing nations engaged in a war which they believe on both ſides to be juſt, let us aſk, What are the means by which this war is to be carried on? The firſt and moſt obvious anſwer is, By all manner of force or open violence; and the moſt able warrior is preſumed to be the one that can invent weapons the moſt deadly and deſtructive. It is admitted alſo, on all hands, that force may be uſed, not only againſt the perſons and goods of rulers, but of every member of the hoſtile ſtate. This may ſeem hard, that innocent ſubjects of a ſtate ſhould ſuffer for the folly and indiſcretion of the rulers, or of other members of the ſame ſtate. But it is often unavoidable. The whole individuals that compoſe a ſtate,

are conſidered but as one body. It would be impoſſible for an enemy to diſtinguiſh the guilty from the innocent. When men ſubmit to a government, they riſk their own perſons and poſſeſſions in the ſame bottom with the whole, in return for the benefits of ſociety.

Upon this principle, open violence may be ſaid to have no bounds, and every method that can be invented to ſend deſtruction and miſery to any part of the hoſtile ſtate, may be thought to be permitted. But upon the principles of general equity, and the conſent and practice of modern times, acts of cruelty and inhumanity, are to be blamed, and to be conſidered as a violation of the law of nations. Many of them might be eaſily enumerated, ſuch as refuſing quarter to thoſe who ſubmit, killing priſoners when they might be kept without any danger, killing women and children, inventing methods of torture, burning and deſtroying every thing that might be of uſe in life. The uſe of poiſoned weapons alſo has been generally condemned, as well as the poiſoning of ſprings and proviſions.

The celebrated Dr. Robertſon of Edinburgh, in a ſermon before the ſociety for propagating Chriſtian knowledge, has made an obſervation to this purpoſe, "that to "the honor of modern times, and (as he thinks) particu- "larly to the honor of Chriſtianity itſelf, there is much "more gentleneſs and humanity in the manner of car- "rying on war than formerly." If we look into ancient hiſtory we ſhall ſee ſuch inſtances of ferocity and cruelty in many caſes, as are too ſhocking to be related. There is no fact, however, in the records of antiquity on this ſubject, that ever ſtruck me ſo much as the account given of Seſoſtris, becauſe it ſhews, not the barbarity of a particular monſter, but the ſpirit of the times. He is extolled by many ancient authors for his clemency, becauſe he did not put to death the princes whom he unjuſtly attacked and conquered. Yet he ordered them to wait upon him, with a yearly tribute, and on theſe occaſions uſed to yoke them in his charriot, and make them draw him, in place of horſes, to the temple. How much worſe than death would this appear at preſent to a captive prince?

But however juſtly praiſe may be due to modern times for comparative humanity, what we have ſaid above is only general and undefined. Let us ſeek for the true principle that ought to govern the conduct of refined and enlightened nations. This, if I miſtake not, is, *That all acts of cruelty which have no tendency to weaken the resisting force, are contrary to reason and religion, and therefore to the law of nature and nations.* The end of war is to obtain juſtice, and reſtore peace, therefore whatever tends to leſſen or deſtroy the force of the enemy, muſt be permitted. It is in this view alone that the capture of private property is allowed and juſtified. But to take lives without neceſſity, and even to treat priſoners with oppreſſion or inſult, above all to diſtreſs or torture the weaker ſex, or the helpleſs infant, ought to be deteſted by every nation profeſſing the goſpel.

The principle which I have laid down, may be applied univerſally, and will ſerve to point out when any meaſure is to be juſtified or condemned, between perſons profeſſing open hoſtility againſt each other. I will take the liberty to apply it to ſome things that have been done or attempted in the preſent war, carried on by Great-Britain againſt America. It is now undeniable that endeavors have been uſed to bring the Indian tribes upon the back ſettlements. This I call an act of extreme and unjuſtifiable barbarity, becauſe their manner of making war is well known. They are neither formidable for their number nor their ſtrength, but for making inroads upon the dwellings of their enemies, and putting to death women and children, with circumſtances of horrid cruelty. This is ſo far from weakening the force of the people againſt whom it is practiſed, that it tends to inſpire them with a revenge and fury not to be reſiſted. The well known hiſtory of the late war, will both explain and ſupport what I have ſaid. The cruelty of the Indians produced ſuch a ſpirit in the back ſettlers, which not only repelled their attacks, but in ſome inſtances retaliated their injuries, in a manner that I will not take upon me either to defend or excuſe. Therefore, when we blame the Britiſh miniſtry for ſtirring up the Indians againſt us, we do not blame them for aſking

assistance from other nations, which is common in all wars, when any party apprehends itself weak, but for a method of attack, the cruelty of which bears no proportion to any advantage that can be derived from it.

The same thing I say of proclaiming liberty to slaves, and stirring them up to rebel against their masters. There is, however, some little difference in the application of the principle to this and the preceding instance. It is probable that the people in Great-Britain reckoned upon a degree of advantage from this measure, vastly superior not only to what it produced in effect, but to what they themselves expected from the incursions of the Indians. I gather this from an expression in a treatise published in England on the American controversy, to this purpose, that 'if England declare freedom to the slaves, they (the Americans) have not six weeks to be a people.' These apprehensions may be thought to justify them in the attempt, as they must have taken it to be so speedy and effectual a means of producing absolute submission. But I must observe, in addition to what I have said above, that there are some things so base and treacherous in their nature, and so pernicious in the example to human society in general, that whatever effect they might be supposed to have in a particular case, all men of liberal minds have concurred in rejecting them. For example, though it is generally agreed that aiming particularly at the life of a leader in battle, is not only lawful but prudent, as it is of more consequence than fifty others, yet to suborn his servants to assassinate him privately, though it might have the same effect upon the military operations, is universally condemned. An instance in history occurs to me, in which a measure, though likely to have a great influence in weakening the enemy, yet, for its extreme cruelty, deserves to be spoken of with horror. It was that of king James VII's general at the siege of Londonderry, 1689, who, when the garrison was reduced to extremity for want of provisions, drove all the protestants within thirty miles, chiefly old men, women and infants, under the walls of the city, to be either taken in, or suffered to perish with hunger under the eyes of their friends. Had this measure

been ſucceſsful, it would have been, notwithſtanding, condemned as unjuſt; but I am happy in being able to obſerve, that acts of extreme cruelty do very ſeldom produce the effects intended by them. When a certain point is exceeded, fear itſelf is converted into rage, and produces the unexpected and incredible efforts of deſpair.

The principle I have above laid down, will alſo enable us to judge what opinion we ſhould form of acts of violence and depredation. When an army can avail itſelf of the goods and property of the members of a hoſtile ſtate, or probably reduce them to the neceſſity of making peace, not only the ſeizure but the reduction of both may be juſtified, upon the principles of reaſon. But when men can only deſtroy and not poſſeſs, and that deſtruction can only fall upon an inconſiderable number of helpleſs people, it is at once inconſiſtent with greatneſs of mind, and for the moſt part againſt the intereſt of the deſtroyer. It operates as an inflammatory principle, and calls up every man, from the ſtrongeſt to the feebleſt, to aſſiſt in repelling or puniſhing the ſavage invader. For this reaſon I give it as my opinion, that burning and deſtroying houſes, where there is no fortreſs, as has been in ſome inſtances done, deſerves all the epithets of barbarous, ſavage and inhuman, that have been beſtowed upon it, either by thoſe who have ſuffered, or thoſe who have felt in their behalf.

A few more reflections ſhould have been added, upon wars differently circumſtanced, and particularly upon civil wars; but they muſt be referred to the next, or ſome future paper.

NUMBER III.

SIR,

MY laſt paper was employed in examining what is the radical principle, according to the law of nature and nations, for determining *the just and lawful means* of carrying on war. Having left the ſubject unfiniſhed, I will now add what ſeems further neceſſary upon it. The chief and moſt remarkable diſtinction of wars, to be found in civilians, is into what they call *foreign* and *civil* wars. By the firſt are to be underſtood, wars between nations confeſſed on both ſides to be ſeparate and independent. By the ſecond, wars between different parts of the ſame ſtate. The firſt are ſuppoſed to ariſe from ſome occaſional injury or partial encroachment, and to have for their end the reparation of the wrong, and the reſtoration of ſecurity and peace. The ſecond, in which one part of the ſubjects of a ſtate riſes againſt another, are much more various, both in their cauſes and ends, although the rulers of every ſtate generally affect to conſider them all as of the ſame nature, and belonging to the ſame claſs. The light in which they wiſh them to be viewed is, as an inſurrection of diſorderly citizens againſt law and order in general, and therefore as including the greateſt crime that can be committed againſt ſociety, and deſerving the ſevereſt puniſhment. This is the true and proper import of the laws againſt treaſon in any country, and if the object on which they take hold is really ſuch as they deſcribe, no fault can be found with their ſeverity. He who breaks the public peace, and attempts to ſubvert the order of the ſociety of which he is a member, is guilty of the greateſt crime againſt every other member, by robbing him of a bleſſing of the greateſt value in itſelf, as well as eſſentially neceſſary to the poſſeſſion of every other.

For this reaſon it is that in civil wars one party takes upon itſelf to be on the ſide of order and good government, and conſiders every perſon of the oppoſing band,

not as a citizen contending for the ſuppoſed rights of his own ſtate, but as a felon, and a criminal breaking the law of God and man, and if ſubdued and taken, deſtined to public, ignominious, legal puniſhment. But let us conſider a little the cauſes and circumſtances of civil wars, as they have appeared in hiſtory. Some have doubtleſs been of the kind above deſcribed, and which the law in general preſumes; but if they have been numerous, they have hardly ever been formidable. Inſurrections of profligate or even miſtaken citizens have generally been local, and occaſioned by ſome circumſtances that do not effect the whole body of an empire, and therefore have been eaſily ſuppreſſed. Many of the civil wars which have torn and diſtracted great empires, have ariſen from the ambition and turbulence of particular men, contending for power and influence in the adminiſtration of government. Such were the wars of Sylla and Marius, Cæſar and Pompey, in the Roman republic; in which, though the partiſans on both ſides were certainly criminal, yet at, the ſame time, they were equally ſo. We may place in the ſame rank, the civil wars in England and France, which were ſo long in the one country, and ſo bloody in both, about the ſucceſſion to the crown. In theſe wars, the principle on which they were waged, was fundamentally wrong, viz. that there was a claim of right in one family or perſon, which entitled them to authority diſtinct from common conſent, or the general good. But this principle was the ſame to both parties; many perſons of equal honor and truth embraced the oppoſite ſides of the queſtion; and we can perceive no difference at all between them, in point of merit or demerit towards the ſociety. If one contends for the uncle, and the other for the nephew, to be king, or the poſterity of each many generations diſtant, and a bloody war muſt decide the queſtion, little other reflection can occur to a conſiderate man, than to pity the weakneſs of human nature.

There remains another claſs of civil wars, in which a part or the great body of a monarchy or republic reſiſt the authority of their rulers, on pretence that they are ſuffering under oppreſſion. They do this ſometimes with

a view to redreſs their grievances and ſometimes to ſubvert their government altogether as inſupportable, and re-ſettle it upon a new foundation. It alſo frequently happens that they begin with the firſt of theſe, and in the courſe of the quarrel find or think it neceſſary to end with the laſt. There are many wars of this kind upon record, ſome of which have been ſucceſsful, and others not. If they have been ſucceſsful, hiſtory dignifies them with the name of Revolution; and if otherwiſe, they muſt bear that of rebellion. Their ſucceſs, however, is no certain criterion of their juſtice. The civil war in England of the laſt century, which bears the name of the grand rebellion, and the late vigorous conteſt of the Corſicans againſt the republic of Genoa, though they were ſold into ſlavery, were as honorable in the principles, as the ſucceſsful reſiſtance of the Seven United Provinces to the king of Spain, or the efforts of the Engliſh nation at that period which we have now agreed to call the *glorious revolution.*

Let us apply theſe remarks to the ſubject of our preſent enquiry, the means and manner of carrying on war. In fact, it has always been found that civil wars have been carried on with a rage and animoſity much greater than thoſe of independant nations. Acts of cruelty have been much more frequent while they laſted; and after peace has taken place, the alienation of mind and inward reſentment has been much greater and of longer continuance. The barbarity of the Syllan and Marian factions to each other in Rome, as well as the proſcription of the two ſubſequent triumvirates of that ſtate, were ſo horrible that it is difficult to conceive how human nature could be brought to ſuch an unfeeling and hardened temper, as to give or execute the bloody orders. As ſoon as a war between independent nations ceaſes, the wound is perfectly healed, and particular perſons of theſe nations do not retain the leaſt degree of reſentment againſt each other. It is quite otherwiſe in civil wars. They often give a name and character to the different factions, which is not obliterated for many generations. Whig and Tory are names by which perſons and families are ſtill diſtinguiſhed in England, although they are both of great anti-

quity, and the firſt of them more than a hundred years old.

Whenever any effect is general and conſtant, there muſt be ſome ſuitable and permanent cauſe or cauſes for it. It may not therefore be amiſs, either in a philoſophical or a moral view, to examine the cauſes of this phenomenon in political life. One cauſe may be aſſigned for it which is very general, but which will perfectly apply to this, as well as to every other kind of ſtrife. The greater the injury that is done, and the ſtronger the obligations to friendſhip that are broken through, the deeper the reſentment that is felt by a ſenſible mind. Now, it is certain that to diſturb the internal peace of a ſtate by a civil war, is a much more dreadful evil, and touches the people more univerſally, than war with a foreign kingdom. Beſides, injuries done, or ſuppoſed to be done, by thoſe with whom we are nearly connected, and from whom we expected every act of friendſhip, wound more deeply than thoſe done by ſtrangers or perſons unknown. This is ſo generally true, that differences between near relations, if they come to a certain height, and are publicly known, are ſcarcely ever thoroughly reconciled. They may be apparently or imperfectly taken away, the ſore may be ſkinned over, but it ſtill rankles at bottom, and upon the ſlighteſt touch is ready to break out anew.

Another cauſe which may be aſſigned for the barbarity exerciſed in civil wars, is the hateful or contemptible idea which the one ſide, at leaſt, often entertains of the other. It is a fine obſervation of a moral writer of the laſt age, "If you want to be wholly free from the guilt of injury, oppreſſion or ſlander, you muſt take care what you *think* of others, for it is certain that your treatment of them will be according to the opinion you have formed of their character and merit." This remark is perfectly juſt: for if once a man allow himſelf to hate another heartily, there is no anſwering for what he will do to him, nor is the natural humanity of his diſpoſition the leaſt ſecurity againſt his going to exceſs. Perſons of the gentleſt nature and the ſofteſt ſex, when completely enraged, have been guilty of the moſt horrid cruelty. This is commonly accounted

for by the mixture of fear and hatred. But if another ingredient is added to the compoſition, it will be yet more powerful; I mean contempt. Some may think that fear and contempt are inconſiſtent, but this is a miſtake. You cannot fear the ſtrength of an enemy and deſpiſe it, at the ſame time; but you may eaſily fear his ſtrength and malice, and deſpiſe his character. If therefore you join all theſe together, fear, hatred and contempt, towards an enemy, it will not be wonderful if the treatment he receives is unmerciful or unjuſt. This is often the caſe in civil wars. Thoſe who are on the ſide of government are apt to form the moſt unjuſt, as well as deſpicable ideas, of their opponents, and never to ſpeak of them but in the moſt opprobrious terms. By this they are naturally led to behave towards them with inhumanity, and ſometimes in their correſpondence they will ſcarce conſider themſelves as upon an equality, or be bound by the laws of ſincerity and truth.

I could illuſtrate the influence of character, and the opinion we entertain of others, on our conduct toward them, by many inſtances in hiſtory. It is the true and genuine ſource of the Roman Catholics not keeping faith with heretics. This their enemies charge them with as an avowed principle; which they deny. But that they have acted agreeably to it is fact. The example of John Huſs of Bohemia, and ſeveral others, put it beyond all queſtion. It is alſo the true cauſe of the cruelty of the inquiſition, commonly called the bloody Tribunal. Nothing is more common than to conſider the miniſters of this court as monſters diveſted of every feeling of humanity, and ſo to lay three fourths of the blame upon the perſonal character, whereas in truth, it ought to be wholly imputed to the power of bigotry and falſe zeal. When once a perſon is believed to be an enemy to God, and meriting his utmoſt vengeance, it is not wonderful that men ſhould co-operate with him, and inflict that little part of it that is in their power. It is not ſo properly ſuffering in itſelf, as the innocence of the ſufferer, or the diſproportion of the ſuffering to the crime, that excites our compaſſion. When crimes are very atrocious, we ſometimes feel, and in ſome degree

regret, the weakneſs of human vengeance, which cannot poſſibly give them their due. I can recollect ſeveral inſtances of criminals, on whoſe condemnation, not one but many would ſay, " he deſerves, if it were poſſible, a thouſand deaths.

But now let me draw this diſſertation to a concluſion, or as divines would ſay, to the application. It is eaſy to ſee, from the above principles, what are the dictates of truth and juſtice as to the manner of carrying on civil wars. There is but one claſs of them in which the behavior ſhould be different from the practice that prevails in wars with independent ſtates; I mean when tumultuous and diſorderly citizens attempt to ſubvert law and order altogether. But when the grounds of the quarrel are plauſible on both ſides, and when it is demonſtrable that perſons of the ſtricteſt honor and integrity may be found adhering to the oppoſite parties, they are bound by every tie to candor in judgment, and to humanity and mercy in their conduct towards each other. Happily we often ſee the parties in ſuch wars compelled to humanity through ſelf-intereſt, and reſtrained by fear of one of the juſteſt of all laws, that of retaliation. I could wiſh, however, that a ſenſe of duty ſhould be added to this obligation; for neither neceſſity, nor even inclination, is ſo ſtable and powerful a principle of action, as reaſon and truth impreſſed on the conſcience. Neceſſity does not always ſeem equally ſtrong, and the impulſe of natural affection is tranſient and changeable; but that which we conſider as eſſential to our duty, we ſhall adhere to without the aſſiſtance of either, and ought to do it even in oppoſition to both.

I do truly think myſelf, in my preſent retirement (begging the reader's pardon) not ill qualified, in point of impartiality, for handling this ſubject, and applying it to the preſent conteſt between Great-Britain and America. I am paſt the age of bearing arms, and whatever I have done before, ſhall probably never again wield any other weapons, than thoſe improperly ſo called, the tongue and the pen. I do clearly ſee the perfect juſtice and great importance of the claim on the one hand, and eaſily conceive the power of prejudice on the other. On the part of America, there

was not the moſt diſtant thought of ſubverting the government, or hurting the intereſt of the people of Great-Britain, but of defending their own privileges from unjuſt encroachment; there was not the leaſt deſire of withdrawing their allegiance from the common ſovereign, till it became abſolutely neceſſary, and indeed was his own choice: On the other hand, I can eaſily conceive that thoſe who have been long accuſtomed to ſubjection, and from whom it is really due, ſhould not ſuddenly enter into the reaſons of exempting a people, otherwiſe ſituated, from the ſame burden. They are therefore of courſe eaſily deceived by falſe or imperfect accounts of a diſtant country, and inſenſibly biaſſed by the phraſeology conſtantly uſed, particularly the terms rebels and rebellion. Upon the whole, as I am now to diſmiſs this ſubject, and proſecute the plan laid down in my firſt number, I ſhall conclude with ſaying, That humanity is the nobleſt attendant on true valor; and that he will probably fight moſt bravely, who never fights till it is neceſſary, and ceaſes to fight as ſoon as the neceſſity is over.

NUMBER IV.

SIR,

ONE of the greateſt difficulties that occurs to writers of miſcellaneous eſſays, and which has been often complained of, is the fixing upon proper ſubjects. We are confined, as a certain writer obſerves, to 'human nature and life,' and yet theſe have been ſo completely ranſacked, and almoſt every character and occurrence has been placed in ſuch a variety of lights, that it is hardly poſſible to find a corner that is wholly untouched. At the ſame time, as to the manner of writing, the reader generally expects two things that ſeem to be incompatible and mutually deſtructive of each other. The one is, that it be ſtriking and original; and the other, that it be ſimple, natural and obvious. If we ſay what any body might ſay, then it is a trite, beaten, common-place, hackneyed topic; and if we ſay what would not readily occur to others, then it is a forced, unnatural, *out of the way* manner of thinking and writing, than which there cannot be a greater diſparagement of either writer or ſpeaker, nor any that will more ſpeedily or effectually prevent his ſucceſs. But notwithſtanding this apparent hardſhip, there is a real juſtice in the expectation of the public in both reſpects, when rightly underſtood. A writer's ſentiments ſhould be properly his own, and yet they ſhould not be too much repugnant to other people's. And as one man's face is eaſily diſtinguiſhed from that of every other, though the general features are the ſame in all, he may preſerve his genuine character without going far *out of the way*, or aiming at any thing odd or particular for this purpoſe. I know not how it is with others, but for my own part, I would rather write on a ſubject that has been often handled, or a character that has been often deſcribed, than one of a contrary kind; becauſe, in ſuch caſes, I can form my own ſentiments with greater preciſion, and expreſs them with greater perſpicuity and force.

The reader may conſider the above as an introduction, preface, or, if he pleaſes, apology for the following diſſertation, which ſhall have for its ſubject a certain human character or quality, generally called *plain common ſenſe*. I muſt, in the firſt place, ſettle the meaning of the expreſſion. There are in every language, certain fine or nice diſtinctions in the uſe both of phraſes and ſingle terms, which, though introduced and finally ſettled by general practice, are not always attended to or fully underſtood. In the caſe before us, I think, the term is uſed very differently in the negative, from what it is in the poſitive form. When we ſay of a man, that he *wants common ſenſe*, we mean that he is a very great fool, and ſometimes that he is the next thing to a changeling or ideot. But when, in the poſitive form, we ſay of a man, that he is a man of *plain common ſenſe*, we give him a good character, and are underſtood by it as affirming that there are not many ſuperior or equal to him in that particular, as alſo that he poſſeſſes a quality of no inconſiderable value. It is plain, that in theſe two ways of ſpeaking, the term common ſenſe ſtands for different things. In the firſt of them it ſignifies, that ſenſe that is really common to all men, or at leaſt nearly univerſal: in the ſecond it ſignifies either ſomething totally different, or at leaſt a degree of that ſenſe which is not poſſeſſed by the plurality, but perhaps is called common, becauſe it may be found in ſome perſons of every rank.

Let me now enquire a little into the characters of common ſenſe. It is the *gift of nature*, and may be clearly diſtinguiſhed from what is acquired by ſtudy or application. In the Thoughts on various Subjects, by Swift and Pope, we have one to this purpoſe, that 'fine ſenſe is not half ſo uſeful as common ſenſe, for he that has the one without the other, is like one that carries nothing about him but gold coin, who muſt be often at a loſs for want of change.' In another of theſe thoughts we are informed, 'that to attempt to move the multitude with fine ſenſe, is like attempting to hew a block with a razor.' With all reſpect to theſe great men, I muſt ſay, that though there is ſomething ſmart and lively in the above recited ſenti-

ments, yet they are more brilliant than juſt; they ſeem to ſuppoſe, that refinement is a thing of the ſame kind with common ſenſe, and only higher in degree, and yet at the ſame time that a man may poſſeſs genuine refinement and be without common ſenſe, neither of which, in my opinion, is true, at leaſt in ſuch a ſenſe as to make their ſimilitudes juſt, or their reaſoning concluſive. Refinement is as different from common ſenſe as the culture is from the ſoil, or the climate from either; but as their joint influence is neceſſary to the production of the crop, ſo fine ſenſe, without common ſenſe as its ground-work and foundation, very ill deſerves the name. If I ſaw a man attempting to hew a block with a razor, or heard him ſpeaking in metaphyſical, abſtract, unintelligible terms, to a multitude of common people, I ſhould heartily agree that he wanted common ſenſe; but that he poſſeſſed fine ſenſe, I ſhould not be eaſily brought to confeſs.

The uſe of ſcientific terms and ſentiments, brought from what is known only to ſcholars and improperly introduced, has been long treated with the contempt it deſerves; but it is conſidered as belonging only to the learned profeſſions. I was well acquainted with a divine many years ago, who began a prayer in his congregation with theſe words, 'O Lord, thou art the ſimpleſt of all beings,' which incenſed his hearers againſt him to ſuch a degree, that they accuſed him of having ſpoken blaſphemy; whereas the poor man only meant to ſay, that God was philoſophically ſimple and uncompounded, altogether different from the groſſneſs, diviſibility, or, as it is ſometimes more learnedly called, the diſcerptibility of matter. I was alſo acquainted with a phyſician, who, ſitting with a lady in her own houſe, and being aſked by her, 'Doctor, are artichokes good for children?' anſwered, 'Madam, they are the leaſt flatulent of all the eſculent tribe,' indeed, doctor, ſays the lady, I do not underſtand a word of what you have ſaid. Now, I think, few would have much admired either the fine or common ſenſe of theſe gentlemen, though certainly the divine would have been conſidered as the greater fool of the two, for phyſicians, as a body, have aſſerted and maintained their right to the uſe of hard

phraſes beyond any other claſs of ſcholars. But there is a certain ſpecies of this fault, which, I think, has not been much taken notice of; and that is, when men, either of high ſtation or real ſenſe and literature, are filled with ſelf-ſufficiency, and cannot think of deſcending to the level of thoſe with whom they converſe, either in ſentiments or phraſeology. I ſuſpect there were a few grains of this failing in the illuſtrious perſons not long ago mentioned; and that their ſentiments, above related, are an evidence of it. In this inſtance, their fine ſenſe was an over match for their common ſenſe, and this was an evident proof of the imperfection of both.

If then fine ſenſe does not differ eſſentially from common ſenſe, and the firſt is nothing more than a certain brightneſs or poliſh given to the laſt, it would ſeem as if by common ſenſe we ought to underſtand the rational powers in general, and the *capacity* of improvement. But here we meet with a difficulty which ſeems to need a reſolution. If common ſenſe is nothing elſe but the ſtrength of the intellectual powers taken complexly, then muſt it be in every perſon in proportion to thoſe powers; and ſcience, if it does not improve, certainly cannot diminiſh it. Yet there is no branch of ſcience whatever but we find ſome perſons capable of learning it, and frequently even of ſhining in it, who are notwithſtanding very defective in common ſenſe, and after their learned acquiſitions, the defect is either greater in itſelf, or at leaſt more viſible than before. We find many who learn the dead languages to great perfection, who learn arithmetic, geometry, natural philoſophy, rhetoric, politics, who even become eminent in ſome of them, and tolerably ſkilled in all, whom yet we reckon greatly inferior to more ignorant perſons, in clear, ſound, common ſenſe.

Perhaps it may be thought that theſe ignorant perſons only wanted the opportunity of improvement, and would have excelled the others alſo in literature had they applied to it. This I do not find to be the caſe, from the inſtances in which a trial has been made. Doubtleſs there are ſome examples of perſons eminently poſſeſſed of judgment or common ſenſe, as well as capable of acquiring

ſkill in the ſciences; but theſe talents are by no means the ſame, or in direct proportion to one another. I have known perſons who ſeemed capable of learning any thing, and who did know a great deal upon many ſubjects, who yet had ſuch a comical caſt in their general behavior, that it was not eaſy to avoid ſmiling at their ſpeech and conduct. I have even known perſons, male and female, with whom you could find no fault, but that their carriage and converſation were too complete and perfect at all times, and yet we ſuſpected them of folly, merely becauſe they were free from the follies and irregularities of others. I remember an inſtance, in early life, of my being in company, for the firſt time, with a certain young lady, and after a few minutes, ſhe aſked me a very judicious queſtion upon the character and hiſtory of Auguſtus Cæſar, which made me immediately ſuſpect that ſhe was not quite ſound; whereas, if ſhe had only ſaid it was a fine day after the rain, or uttered any other ſuch wiſe and pertinent reflection, I ſhould have concluded nothing to her prejudice. On the other hand, there are many inſtances of perſons who have made trial of ſtudy and ſcience with very little ſucceſs, and who, giving them up, have applied to active life, and have deſervedly acquired the character of clear-headed, ſenſible, judicious men. The truth is, the diſtinction between literature and common ſenſe, ſeems to be well known and generally acknowledged. There are ſome who evidently give way to, or even affect an abſence of mind, from forgetfulneſs and inattention to what they are about, and expect we ſhould conſider it as an indication of profound ſtudy and deep learning. This is one of the moſt ridiculous pieces of affectation imaginable. Such gentlemen, if they be logicians, ſhould be told that *a particulari ad universale non valet consequentia.* We know very well that ſome great ſcholars are fools, but this will never prove that all fools are great ſcholars. Upon the whole, it ſeems that ſcience, or a capacity for it, is not common ſenſe.

Since then common ſenſe is a gift of nature, different from a capacity for ſcience in general, ſhall we ſay that it is genius, including particularly thoſe exalted and admired

talents which have been, by ſome of the lateſt writers, called the powers of imagination. Here we are further from the point than ever, for great wit and a lively imagination are rather conſidered as oppoſed to judgment and prudence, and other happy fruits of common ſenſe. So much is this the caſe, that the poet has been often cited with approbation, who ſays,

> " Great wit to madneſs ſure is near allied,
> And thin partitions do their bounds divide."

It is common to ſay, that ſuch a man has more ſail than ballaſt, meaning that his imagination, fire and ſprightlineſs are an overmatch for his prudence, and clearly carrying the ſuppoſition, that this laſt quality is as oppoſite to the others, as ſail is to ballaſt, or even motion to reſt. To all this may be added, that ſome who really were, and many who deſired to be thought, men of great genius, have actually claimed it as their right, not to be confined to common forms, and indeed have generally acted accordingly.

We have ſeen then that refinement, ſcience, genius, are not common ſenſe, ſhall we now go any further? Is there not a character in which there is knowledge of the moſt liberal kind, clearneſs of underſtanding, penetration of mind upon every ſubject, and yet a weakneſs or want of common ſenſe, in conduct and behavior? Are there not ſome who ſeem to have, not only all other ſenſes, but common ſenſe too, for every body but themſelves? They can immediately and readily diſcover the miſtakes of others, they can give the beſt and ſoundeſt advice upon every ſubject, and yet never could act a wiſe part themſelves on any ſubject. Some who are even connoiſſeurs in œconomy, never can keep their own affairs in tolerable order. I have known a gentleman who reduced himſelf to beggary by fooliſh projects, yet, after having ſold his paternal inheritance, he employed himſelf in thinking and writing on that ſubject on which he had acted wrong, and publiſhed eſſays on agriculture, modeſtly pointing out to gentlemen and farmers by how ſmall a portion of land, well improved, they might ſpeedily acquire a plentiful eſtate.

Upon comparing all theſe obſervations together, I beg leave to lay down a few propoſitions which appear to be neareſt the truth in the way of theory or ſyſtem, and on them to ground a few practical advices. There ſeem to be three ſeparate qualities of the human mind very well expreſſed in the old philoſophy, by the three known terms of memory, imagination and judgment. Theſe are truly diſtinct one from another; for any one of them may not only exiſt, but be in high perfection, in the abſence of both the others. This will not, I think, be doubted as to the two firſt, and even as to the laſt, I have known ſome perſons not only without imagination as a talent, but with very little taſte for works of imagination, and whoſe memory was no ways remarkable, who have paſſed through life with great dignity and credit, who, with or without learning, have conducted their own affairs with prudence and diſcretion, and diſcovered the higheſt ſenſe of propriety and decorum in all their intercourſe with others, under the happy guidance of plain common ſenſe.

In the next place, though theſe qualities are diſtinct, they are by no means incompatible. There have been inſtances of perſons who poſſeſſed all the three in high perfection; and there muſt be a conſiderable proportion of each to form a character truly illuſtrious. Some, in whom imagination has been very ſtrong, have alſo been remarkable for clearneſs of judgment in their works, good ſenſe and prudence in their whole deportment. The ſame thing I ſay of memory. Some prodigies of memory have been defective in judgment, but many great men have alſo excelled in this reſpect, and no ſmall meaſure of it is neceſſary both in works of genius and the functions of public life. Again,

Of theſe three qualities, judgment is by far the moſt valuable and important. Of itſelf it is amiable and reſpectable, while the others, without it, are contemptible, uſeleſs or hurtful. A man of memory without judgment, is a fool; and a man of imagination, without judgment, is mad. but when this great quality takes the government of both, they acquire luſtre, and command univerſal eſ-

teem. No human accompliſhment, unleſs it has this as its foundation and ground-work, can reach perfection, even in its own kind. Memory will make a linguiſt, imagination will make a poet, penetration will make a philoſopher, public life will make a politician, and court breeding will make a man of faſhion; yet all of them are eſſentially defective, if common ſenſe is weak or wanting. There is ſomething in the application and direction of all theſe accompliſhments which judgment muſt ſupply, and which neither inſtruction, example, nor even experience will beſtow.

It is probable that many would readily grant me (what yet I do not aſk, being hardly of the ſame opinion) that of all the characters juſt now mentioned, that of a man of faſhion or politeneſs is the moſt ſuperficial, and what may be moſt eaſily attained by imitation and habit. Yet even here, nothing is more eaſy than to ſee the dominion of judgment and good ſenſe, or the prevalence of folly and indiſcretion. That want of preſence of mind or embarraſſment, which is often the effect of modeſty or baſhfulneſs, nay, even the errors and blunders which viſibly proceed from ignorance and miſtake of the reigning mode, are not half ſo abſurd and ridiculous, as the affected airs and miſplaced ceremonies of a fop, of which the ladies are always moſt attentive obſervers, and to give them their due, generally not incompetent judges.

Once more, judgment is an original and radical quality, that is of all others leaſt capable of being communicated by inſtruction, or even improved or augmented by culture. Memory and imagination are alſo gifts of nature; but they may be greatly increaſed, the one by exerciſe, and the other by indulgence. You may teach a man any thing in the world but prudence, which is the genuine offspring of common ſenſe. It is generally ſaid that experience teaches fools, but the meaning of the proverb is often miſtaken, for it does not ſignify that experience makes them wiſe: it ſignifies that they never are wiſe at all, but perſiſt in ſpite of inſtruction, warning and example, till they feel the effects of their own folly. If a man is born with a fund of good ſenſe and natural diſcern-

ment, it will appear in the very firſt ſtages of his education. He who outſtrips his fellows in a grammar ſchool, will not always be the greateſt ſcholar in advanced life; but he who does not diſcover diſcernment and ſagacity when a boy, will never be diſtinguiſhed for it ſo long as he lives. It is often ſaid, in a certain country, that a fool of forty will never be wiſe; which is ſometimes underſtood as if a man made as regular a progreſs to the ſummit of his wiſdom, till the age of forty, as he does to that of his ſtature till twenty; which is a very great miſtake. I take it to be in this caſe, as in the other, that a man of forty has ſufficiently proved to all the world that he is not, and therefore that he never was, and never will be wiſe.

Shall we ſay then that this moſt valuable of all human qualities receives no benefit at all from a well conducted education, from ſtudy, or from an acquaintance with the world. I anſwer, that I do not think it is capable of any change in its nature, or addition to its vigor, but it may be joined to other talents of more or leſs value, and it may be applied to purpoſes more or leſs uſeful and important, and thence acquire a luſtre and poliſh, of which it would otherwiſe be deſtitute. The ſame good ſenſe and prudence, which alone would make a ſenſible judicious farmer, would, if united to memory and imagination, and enriched with ſkill in the liberal arts, make an eminent ſcholar, and bring in large contributions to the treaſury of human ſcience. The ſame ſoundneſs of judgment, which, in a country life or contracted neighborhood, would ſet an example of frugality, be an enemy to diſorder, and point out the poſſeſſor as a proper umpire in unhappy diſſentions; would, in a more enlarged ſphere, make an accompliſhed ſenator or a politician, to manage the affairs of a large community, or ſettle the differences of contending nations.

I come now to offer my readers ſome advices, a practice to which I am by nature and habit exceedingly prone. A difficulty, it muſt be confeſſed, ſeems to occur in this matter. If the above theory be juſt, there ſeems to be little room left for advice, as the great talent, ſo largely

deſcribed, is ſuppoſed to be original and unalterable. This difficulty, however, notwithſtanding, important inſtruction may be grafted upon it, not only to parents and others who have the charge of the education of youth, but to every man, for the future direction of his own conduct.

As to the firſt of theſe, I would intreat parents to guard againſt that fond partiality which inclines them to form a wrong judgment of the capacity of their children; particularly, it were to be wiſhed, that they would not take a few ſallies of pertneſs and vivacity for an evidence of diſtinguiſhed parts. It is well known, and has been frequently obſerved, how apt parents are to entertain their viſitors with an account of the bright ſayings or ſhrewd ſchemes of their children, as moſt promiſing ſymptoms of their future talents; and yet, ſo far as my obſervation reaches, the things related might for the moſt part juſtify a contrary ſuppoſition. I ſhould run little riſk in affirming, that three fourths at leaſt of thoſe anecdotes, which parents relate with ſo much triumph of their children, are to be accounted for from memory, or petulance, or even ſtupidity. A child will repeat, at an improper time, a phraſe or remark that he has heard, and it will make ſo abſurd a contraſt with what is going on, that it is impoſſible to forbear laughing. I aſk whether this is an evidence of the greatneſs or the want of underſtanding in the child? Another will give an inſolent and ſaucy anſwer, and acquire great reputation for what deſerved the moſt ſevere and exemplary correction. To crown all, I will tell a true ſtory: An old gentleman, whom I knew, would often ſay, in commendation of his ſon's wiſdom, then a boy about ten or twelve year's of age, That when other boys are breaking their legs by falls from limbs of trees, or going a fiſhing in rivers, at the riſk of being drowned, his ſon would fiſh a whole afternoon with a crooked pin, in a tub of foul water in the kitchen. I ſuppoſe any reader will agree, that the fact and the remark taken together, conſtitute a full proof that the mother was honeſt, and the ſon lawfully begotten.

It would be a great advantage, that parents ſhould make a moderate eſtimation of the talents of their chil-

dren, in two reſpects. (1.) It would preſerve the children themſelves from being puffed up with unmerited praiſe, and thus miſtaking their own character and capacity. Though the native force and vigor of common ſenſe can neither be augmented nor deſtroyed, yet it may be, and I believe frequently is neglected and deſpiſed, or overgrown by the rank weeds of oſtentation and ſelf ſufficiency. When young perſons are vain of the talents which they do not poſſeſs, or ambitious of a character which they cannot attain, they become ridiculous in their conduct, and are generally unſucceſsful in their purſuits. (2.) It would incline and make their parents to conduct their education in the moſt proper manner, by giving particular attention to thoſe branches of inſtruction, which, though leſs ſplendid, are more generally uſeful than ſome others. It would lead me too much into detail to give many examples for the illuſtration of this remark, and therefore I ſhall only ſay, that common ſenſe, which is a modeſt unaſſuming quality, and a diligent application to the uſeful parts of ſcience, will neither diſtreſs nor weaken a fervent imagination, when it really reſides in the ſame ſubject; but giving looſe reins to a warm imagination, will often overſet a moderate degree of judgment, ſo that it will never more dare to ſhow its head. I have known ſome youths of bright genius in their own eſteem, who have looked down with great contempt upon quiet and orderly boys as dull plodding fellows, and yet theſe laſt have, in the iſſue, become men of ſpirit and capacity, as well as literature, while the others have evaporated into rakes and bullies, and indeed blockheads; or taking the road to Mount Helicon, have become poets, fools and beggars.

I muſt adviſe every reader, eſpecially thoſe in early years, to form his opinion of others, and his friendly attachments, upon the principles above laid down. Nothing will more effectually miſlead young perſons than an exceſſive admiration of ſhowy talents in thoſe with whom they converſe, whether they be real or ſuppoſed. I have known many inſtances of perſons who apparently owed their ruin to their imbibing, early in life, a notion

that decency, order, and a prudent management of their affairs, were marks of dulneſs; and on the contrary, that petulance, frowardneſs and irregularity, and even vicious exceſſes, were the effects of ſpirit and capacity. Many follow the leading perſon in frolics, not from any inward approbation of ſuch practices, but merely to avoid the reproach which in ſuch ſocieties is ſo unjuſtly beſtowed. I beg all ſuch to believe me, as a perſon of ſome experience in places of public education, when I aſſure them, that in nine inſtances out of ten, your ramblers, night-walkers, and miſchief workers, are blockheads and thick-ſculls. Does it require any genius, think you, to throw a log in another's way in a dark paſſage, and after he has ſtumbled over it, to raiſe a triumphant laugh at him, who was ſuch a fool as not to ſee without light.

I conclude with obſerving, that whatever may be the capacity of any perſon in itſelf, if it is neglected or miſimproved, it will either be wholly loſt or be of little conſequence in future life. Our very bodily frame preſents us with a leſſon of inſtruction upon this ſubject. Though formed by nature complete and regular, if it is accuſtomed to any improper torture or ungraceful motion, the habit will ſoon become unconquerable; and any particular limb or member that for a long time is not uſed, will become uſeleſs. This holds yet more ſtrongly as to the powers of the mind: they are loſt by negligence; but by proper application they are preſerved, improved, and in many caſes increaſed. Let all, therefore, who wiſh or hope to be eminent, remember, that as the height to which you can raiſe a tower, depends upon the ſize and ſolidity of its baſe, ſo they ought to lay the foundation of their future fame deep and ſtrong, in ſobriety, prudence and patient induſtry, which are the genuine dictates of *plain common ſenſe.*

NUMBER V.

SIR,

A MAN is not, even at this time, called or conſidered as a ſcholar, unleſs he is acquainted in ſome degree with the ancient languages, particularly the Greek and Latin. About one hundred and fifty years ago, however, thoſe languages were better underſtood than they are at preſent; becauſe, at that time, authors of reputation publiſhed almoſt all their works in Latin. Since the period above mentioned, the modern, or as they are ſometimes called, the northern languages, have been gradually poliſhed, and each nation has manifeſted a zeal for, and an attention to, the purity and perfection of its own tongue. This has been the caſe, particularly, with reſpect to the French and Engliſh. The French language is, as nearly as I can gueſs, about fifty years before the Engliſh, in this reſpect; that is to ſay, it is ſo much longer ſince their men of letters applied themſelves to the aſcertaining, correcting and poliſhing of it. The Engliſh, however, has received great improvements within the laſt hundred years, and probably will continue to do ſo. He muſt have little judgment, or great obſtinacy, who does not confeſs that ſome late authors have written the Engliſh language with greater purity, than thoſe of the firſt character in former times. From this we may certainly infer, that the education muſt be very imperfect in any ſeminary where no care is taken to form the ſcholars to taſte, propriety and accuracy, in that language which they muſt ſpeak and write all their life afterwards.

To theſe reflections it may be added, that our ſituation in America is now, and in all probability will continue to be ſuch, as to require peculiar attention upon this ſubject. The Engliſh language is ſpoken through all the United States. We are at a great diſtance from the iſland of Great-Britain, in which the ſtandard of the language is as yet ſuppoſed to be found. Every ſtate is equal to and in-

dependent of every other; and, I believe, none of them will agree, at leaſt immediately, to receive laws from another, in diſcourſe, any more than in action. Time and accident muſt determine what turn affairs will take in this reſpect in future, whether we ſhall continue to conſider the language of Great-Britain as the pattern upon which we are to form ours; or whether, in this new empire, ſome centre of learning and politeneſs will not be found, which ſhall obtain influence and preſcribe the rules of ſpeech and writing to every other part.

While this point is yet unſettled, it has occurred to me to make ſome obſervations upon the preſent ſtate of the Engliſh language in America, and to attempt a collection of ſome of the chief improprieties which prevail, and might be eaſily corrected. I will premiſe one or two general remarks. The vulgar in America ſpeak much better than the vulgar in Great-Britain, for a very obvious reaſon, viz. that being much more unſettled, and moving frequently from place to place, they are not ſo liable to local peculiarities, either in accent or phraſeology. There is a greater difference in dialect between one county and another in Britain, than there is between one ſtate and another in America. I ſhall alſo admit, though with ſome heſitation, that gentlemen and ſcholars in Great-Britain ſpeak as much with the vulgar in common chit chat, as perſons of the ſame claſs do in America: but there is a remarkable difference in their public and ſolemn diſcourſes. I have heard in this country, in the ſenate, at the bar, and from the pulpit, and ſee daily in diſſertations from the preſs, errors in grammar, improprieties and vulgariſms, which hardly any perſon of the ſame claſs, in point of rank and literature, would have fallen into in Great-Britain. Curioſity led me to make a collection of theſe, which, as ſoon as it became large, convinced me that they were of very different kinds, and therefore muſt be reduced to a conſiderable number of claſſes, in order to their being treated with critical juſtice. Theſe I now preſent to the public under the following heads, to each of which I will ſubjoin a ſhort explication, and a

number of examples, with remarks where they ſeem neceſſary.

1. Americaniſms, or ways of ſpeaking peculiar to this country.
2. Vulgariſms in England and America.
3. Vulgariſms in America only.
4. Local phraſes or terms.
5. Common blunders ariſing from ignorance.
6. Cant phraſes.
7. Perſonal blunders.
8. Technical terms introduced into the language.

It will be proper to put the reader in mind, that he ought not to expect that the enumeration under each of theſe heads can be complete. This would have required a very long courſe of obſervation; and indeed is not neceſſary to my purpoſe, which is by ſpecimens to enable every attentive and judicious perſon to make obſervations for himſelf.

1. The firſt claſs I call Americaniſms, by which I underſtand an uſe of phraſes or terms, or a conſtruction of ſentences, even among perſons of rank and education, different from the uſe of the ſame terms or phraſes, or the conſtruction of ſimilar ſentences, in Great-Britain. It does not follow, from a man's uſing theſe, that he is ignorant, or his diſcourſe upon the whole inelegant; nay, it does not follow in every caſe, that the terms or phraſes uſed are worſe in themſelves, but merely that they are of American and not of Engliſh growth. The word Americaniſm, which I have coined for the purpoſe, is exactly ſimilar in its formation and ſignification to the word Scotticiſm. By the word Scotticiſm is underſtood any term or phraſe, and indeed any thing either in conſtruction, pronunciation, or accentuation, that is peculiar to North-Britain. There are many inſtances in which the Scotch way is as good, and ſome in which every perſon who has the leaſt taſte as to the propriety or purity of language in general, muſt confeſs that it is better, than that of England, yet ſpeakers and writers muſt conform to cuſtom.

Scotland, or the northern part of Great-Britain, was once a ſeparate independent kingdom, though, except in the Highlands, the people ſpoke the ſame language as in England; the inhabitants of the Lowlands, in both countries, having been originally the ſame. It is juſtly obſerved by Dr. Robertſon, in his hiſtory of Scotland, that had they continued ſeparate kingdoms, ſo that there ſhould have been a court and parliament at Edinburgh, to ſerve as a ſtandard, the ſmall differences in dialect and even in pronunciation, would not have been conſidered as defects; and there would have been no more opprobrium attending the uſe of them in ſpeech or writing, than there was in the uſe of the different dialects of the ancient Grecian republics. But by the removal of the court to London, and eſpecially by the union of the two kingdoms, the Scottiſh manner of ſpeaking came to be conſidered as provincial barbariſm; which, therefore, all ſcholars are now at the utmoſt pains to avoid. It is very probable that the reverſe of this, or rather its counter part, will happen in America. Being entirely ſeparated from Britain, we ſhall find ſome centre or ſtandard of our own, and not be ſubject to the inhabitants of that iſland, either in receiving new ways of ſpeaking, or rejecting the old.

The examples follow.

1. "The United States, or *either* of them." This is ſo far from being a mark of ignorance, that it is uſed by many of the moſt able and accurate ſpeakers and writers, yet it is not Engliſh. The United States are thirteen in number, but in Engliſh either does not ſignify one of many, but *one or the other* of two. I imagine *either* has become an adjective pronoun, by being a ſort of abbreviation of a ſentence where it is uſed adverbially, *either the one or the other.* It is exactly the ſame with *ekateros* in Greek, and *alterutur* in Latin.

2. This is to *notify* the public; or the people had not been *notified.* By this is meant *inform* and *informed.* In Engliſh we do not notify the perſon of the thing, but notify the thing to the perſon. In this inſtance there is certainly an impropriety, *for to notify* is juſt ſaying by a word of Latin derivation, *to make known.* Now if you cannot

ſay this is to make the public known, neither ought you to ſay this is to notify the public.

3. *Fellow countrymen.* This is a word of very frequent uſe in America. It has been heard in public orations from men of the firſt character, and may be daily ſeen in newspaper publications. It is an evident tautology, for the laſt word expreſſes fully the meaning of both. If you open any dictionary, you will find the word countryman ſignifies one born in the ſame country. You may ſay fellow citizens, fellow ſoldiers, fellow ſubjects, fellow chriſtians, but not *fellow countrymen.*

4. Theſe things were ordered delivered to the army. The words *to be* are omitted. I am not certain whether this is a local expreſſion or general in America.

5. I wiſh we could contrive it to Philadelphia. The words *to carry it*, *to have it carried*, or ſome ſuch, are wanting. It is a defective conſtruction, of which there are but too many that have already obtained in practice, in ſpite of all the remonſtrances of men of letters.

6. We may *hope* the aſſiſtance of God. The word *for* or *to receive* is wanting. In this inſtance hope, which is a neuter verb, is turned into the active verb, and not very properly as to the objective term aſſiſtance. It muſt be admitted, however, that in ſome old Engliſh poets, hope is ſometimes uſed as an active verb, but it is contrary to modern practice.

7. I do not conſider myſelf equal to this taſk. The word *as* is wanting. I am not certain whether this may not be an Engliſh vulgariſm, for it is frequently uſed by the renowned author of Common Senſe, who is an Engliſhman born ; but he has ſo happy a talent of adopting the blunders of others, that nothing deciſive can be inferred from his practice. It is, however, undoubtedly an Americaniſm, for it is uſed by authors greatly ſuperior to him in every reſpect.

8. Neither to day *or* to morrow. The proper conſtruction is, either the one or the other, neither the one *nor* the other.

9. A *certain* Thomas Benſon. The word certain, as uſed in Engliſh, is an indefinite, the name fixes it preciſe-

ly, ſo that there is a kind of contradiction in the expreſſion. In England they would ſay, a certain perſon called or ſuppoſed to be Thomas Benſon.

10. Such bodies are *incident* to theſe evils. The evil is incident or ready to fall upon the perſon, the perſon liable or ſubject to the evil.

11. He is a very *clever* man. She is quite a *clever* woman. How often are theſe phraſes to be heard in converſation? Their meaning, however, would certainly be miſtaken when heard for the firſt time by one born in Britain. In theſe caſes, Americans generally mean by *clever*, only goodneſs of diſpoſition, worthineſs, integrity, without the leaſt regard to capacity; nay, if I am not miſtaken, it is frequently applied, where there is an acknowledged ſimplicity, or mediocrity of capacity. But in Britain, clever always means capacity, and may be joined either to a good or bad diſpoſition. We ſay of a man, he is a clever man, a clever tradeſman, a clever fellow, without any reflection upon his moral character, yet at the ſame time it carries no approbation of it. It is exceeding good Engliſh, and very common to ſay, He is a clever fellow, but I am ſorry to ſay it, he is alſo a great rogue. When cleverneſs is applied primarily to conduct, and not to the perſon, it generally carries in it the idea of art or chicanery, not very honorable; for example—Such a plan I confeſs was very clever, i. e. ſly, artful, well contrived, but not very fair.

12. I was quite mad at him, he made me quite mad. In this inſtance mad is only a metaphor for angry. This is perhaps an Engliſh vulgariſm, but it is not found in any accurate writer, nor uſed by any good ſpeaker, unleſs when poets or orators uſe it as a ſtrong figure, and to heighten the expreſſion ſay, he was mad with rage.

Theſe ſhall ſuffice for the firſt claſs.

NUMBER VI.

SIR,

I PROCEED now upon the plan laid down in my laſt paper, to the ſecond general claſs of improprieties, viz. vulgariſms in England and America. Of theſe there is great plenty to be found every where, in writing and in converſation. They need very little explication, and indeed would ſcarcely deſerve to be mentioned in a diſcourſe of this nature, were it not for the circumſtance hinted at in the introduction, that ſcholars and public perſons are at leſs pains to avoid them here, than in Britain.

1. I will mention the vulgar abbreviations in general, as an't, can't, han't, don't, ſhould'nt, would'nt, could'nt, &c. Great pains were taken by the Spectator to ſhew the barbarity and inelegance of that manner of ſpeaking and writing. The endeavors of that author, and others of later date, have been ſucceſsful in Britain, and have baniſhed all ſuch harſh and mutilated phraſes from public ſpeaking, ſo that they remain only in converſation, and not even in that among perſons of judgment and taſte. I need hardly ſay how far this is from being the caſe in America.

2. I *know'd* him perfectly well, for, I *knew* him.

3. I *see* him yeſterday, or I *see* him laſt week, for I *saw* him. In Scotland the vulgar ſay, I *seed* him laſt week.

4. *This here* report of *that there* committee. Some merchants, whom I could name, in the Engliſh Parliament, whoſe wealth and not merit raiſed them to that dignity, uſe this vulgariſm very freely, and expoſe themſelves to abundance of ridicule by ſo doing.

5. He was *drownded* in the Delaware. This is ſo common, that I have known a gentleman reading it in a book to a company, though it was printed *drowned*, read *drownded*.

6. She has got a new *gownd*. This and the former are vulgariſms in converſation only; but even their very

improper and unbecoming for perſons of education. In London you are ſometimes aſked if you will take a glaſs of *wind*, for wine. Of the ſame nature are an impertinent *fellar*, for *fellow*; *waller*, for *wallow*; *winder*, for *window*.

7. Some on'em, one on'em, many on'em. This, though frequent in the northern parts of England, and ſome parts of America, perhaps is rather local than general. This indeed may be the caſe with ſeveral others which have fallen under my obſervation.

8. It *lays* in Bucks county, for it *lies*, &c. This is not only a prevailing vulgariſm in converſation, but has obtained in public ſpeaking, and may be often ſeen in print. I am even of opinion that it has ſome chance of overcoming all the oppoſition made to it, and fully eſtabliſhing itſelf by cuſtom, which is the final arbiter in all ſuch caſes. Lowth, in his grammar, has been at much pains to correct it; yet, though that moſt excellent treatiſe has been in the hands of the public for many years, this word ſeems to gain inſtead of loſing ground. The error ariſes from confounding the neuter verb to *ly* with the active verb to *lay*, which are very different in the preſent, preterite and participle. The firſt of them is formed thus, ly, lay, lien or lain; the ſecond, lay, laid, laid.

9. I *thinks* it will not be long before he come. This is a London vulgariſm, and yet one of the groſſeſt kind. To this confuſion or diſagreement of the perſon, may be added the diſagreement of the number, giving a verb ſingular to a nominative plural, which is more frequent than the other, as, after all the *stories* that *has* been told, all the *reasons* that *has* been given.

10. Equally *as* well, and equally *as* good. This is frequent in converſation and public ſpeaking. It is alſo to be found in ſome publications, of which it is needleſs to name the authors; but it is juſt as good Engliſh to ſay, the *most highest* mountain in America.

11. One of the moſt common vulgariſms or blunders in the Engliſh language, is putting the preterite for the participle. This is taken particular notice of by Lowth, in his grammar, as after he had *fell* down, for *fallen*;

and in the same manner, *rose*, for *risen ; spoke*, for *spoken ; wrote*, for *written ; broke*, for *broken*. Some of these appear, as he observes, barbarous to scholars ; others we are so accustomed to, that they give little offence to the ear. Had not a gentleman *threw* out—the reasons of protest were *drew* up. These are offensive, but you may meet with similar errors even in good authors, such as I had *wrote*, I had *spoke*, the bone was *broke*. The best way to judge of this impropriety, is to try it upon a word that has been seldom so misused, as for example, If you go to the battle perhaps you will be *slew*.

12. Just as you *rise* the hill—little or no bread-corn is *grown* in this country. These are similar corruptions arising from turning neuter into active or passive verbs. They are also, if I am not mistaken, among the newest corruptions of the language, and much more common in England than America. The above two examples are taken from Cook's first voyage, by Hawkesworth, where some others of the same kind are to be found.

13. I *sat* out yesterday morning, for I set out. The verb set has no change of termination ; the present, preterite and participle being the same. I set out immediately ; I set out three days sooner than he ; after I had set out. The error lies in taking the preterite of the verb *sit*, and making use of it for the past time of the other—sit has three terminations, sit, sat, sitten.

14. He said *as how* it was his opinion. This absurd pleonasm is more common in Britain than in America.

The third class consists of vulgarisms in America only. This must be understood, so far as I have been able to observe, and perhaps some of them are local. It will not be necessary either to make the examples on this head numerous, or to say much upon them, because the introduction of vulgarisms into writing or public discourses is the same, whether they are of one country or another.

1. I have not done it yet, but am just going to. This is an imperfect construction ; it wants the words *do it*. Imperfect constructions are the blemish of the English language in general, and rather more frequent in this country than in England.

2. It is *partly all* gone, it is *mostly all* gone. This is an abſurdity or barbariſm, as well as a vulgariſm.

3. This is the weapon with which he defends himſelf when he is *attacted*, for attacked; or according to the abbreviation, attack'd.

4. As I told Mr. ——, for as I told you. I hope Mr. —— is well this morning. What is Mr. ——'s opinion upon this ſubject? This way of ſpeaking to one who is preſent in the third perſon, and as if he were abſent, is uſed in this country by way of reſpect. No ſuch thing is done in Britain, except that to perſons of very high rank, they ſay your majeſty, your grace, your lordſhip; yet even there the continuance of the diſcourſe in the third perſon is not cuſtomary.

5. I have been *to* Philadelphia, for *at* or *in* Philadelphia; I have been *to* dinner, for I have dined.

6. Walk *in* the houſe, for *into* the houſe.

7. You *have no right* to pay it, where right is uſed for what logicians would call the correlative term obligation.

8. A *ſpell* of ſickneſs, a long *ſpell*, a bad *ſpell*. Perhaps this word is borrowed from the ſea dialect.

9. *Every* of theſe ſtates; *every* of them; *every* of us; for *every one*. I believe the word every is uſed in this manner in ſome old Engliſh writers, and alſo in ſome old laws, but not in modern practice. The thing is alſo improper, becauſe it ſhould be every one to make it ſtrictly a partitive, and ſubject to the ſame conſtruction, as ſome of them, part of them, many of them, &c. yet it muſt be acknowledged, that there is no greater impropriety, if ſo great, in the vulgar conſtruction of *every*, than in another expreſſion very common in both countries, viz. *all of them*.

Having finiſhed theſe two claſſes, I ſhall make a remark or two upon vulgariſms in general. Probably many will think and ſay, that it would be a piece of ſtiffneſs or affectation to avoid them wholly, in converſation or common diſcourſe. As to ſome of thoſe which have been deſcribed above, perhaps this may be admitted; but as to the greateſt part, it is certainly beſt to avoid them wholly, leſt we ſhould fall into them inadvertently where

they would be highly improper. If a gentleman will not imitate a peaſant, male or female, in ſaying *if ſo be*, and *forſooth*, and many other ſuch phraſes, becauſe he knows they are vulgariſms, why ſhould he imitate them in ſaying *equally as good*, or I *see him yesterday*, but becauſe he does not know, or does not attend to the impropriety?

The reader is alſo deſired to obſerve, that we are not by far ſo much in danger of the charge of affectation for what we omit ſaying, as for what we do ſay. When a man is fond of introducing hard words, or ſtudies a nice or pompous diction, he brings himſelf immediately into contempt; but he may eaſily attain a cautious habit of avoiding low phraſes or vulgar terms, without being at all liable to the imputation either of vanity or conſtraint.

I conclude with obſerving, that as bombaſt and empty ſwelling is the danger to which thoſe are expoſed who aim at ſublimity, ſo low ſentiments and vulgar terms are what thoſe are moſt in danger of who aim at ſimplicity. Now, as it is my intention, in the courſe of theſe papers, to ſet a mark of reprobation upon every affected and fantaſtic mode of expreſſion, and to recommend a pure, and, as it may be called, claſſic ſimplicity, it is the more neceſſary to guard the reader againſt that low and grovelling manner which is ſometimes miſtaken for it.

NUMBER VII.

SIR,

THE fourth claſs of improprieties conſiſt of *local phrases* or *terms*. By theſe I mean ſuch vulgariſms as prevail in one part of a country and not in another. There is a much greater variety of theſe in Britain than in America. From the complete populations of the country, multitudes of common people never remove to any diſtance from where they were born and bred. Hence there are many characteriſtic diſtinctions, not only in phraſeology, but in accent, dreſs, manners, &c. not only between one county and another, but between different cities of the ſame county. There is a county in the North of England, very few of the natives of which can pronounce the letter *r*, as it is generally pronounced in the other parts of the kingdom.

But if there is a much greater number of local vulgariſms in Britain than America, there is alſo for this very reaſon, much leſs danger of their being uſed by gentlemen or ſcholars. It is indeed implied in the very nature of the thing, that a local phraſe will not be uſed by any but the inhabitants or natives of that part of the country where it prevails. However, I am of opinion, that even local vulgariſms find admiſſion into the diſcourſe of people of better rank more eaſily here than in Europe.

1. He *improved* the horſe for ten days. This is uſed in ſome parts of New-England for riding the horſe.

2. *Raw salad* is uſed in the South for *salad*. N. B. There is no ſalad boiled.

3. *Chunks*, that is brands, half burnt wood. This is cuſtomary in the middle colonies.

4. He is *considerable* of a ſurveyor, *considerable* of it may be found in that country. This manner of ſpeaking prevails in the northern parts.

5. He will *once in a while*, i. e. *sometimes* get drunk. The middle ſtates.

6. Shall I have *occasion*, i. e. opportunity to go over the ferry. New-England.

7. *Tot* is uſed for *carry*, in ſome of the ſouthern ſtates.

The fifth claſs of improprieties may be called *common blunders through ignorance.* In this they differ from the former claſſes, that the ſimilarity of one word to another, in pronunciation or derivation, makes ignorant people confound them and uſe them promiſcuouſly, or ſometimes even convert them and uſe them each in the other's room. The following are examples.

1. *Eminent* for *imminent.* How often do we hear that a man was in eminent danger.

2. *Ingenious* for *ingenuous.* How common is it to ſay he is an ingenious young man—he is a young man of a very ingenious diſpoſition. they are both Engliſh words. Ingenious ſignifies of good capacity ; ingenuous ſignifies ſimple, upright, ſincere ; ingenuity, however, the word that ſeems to be derived from ingenuous, is uſed in both ſenſes, ſometimes for fairneſs, openneſs, candor ; ſometimes for capacity or acuteneſs of invention. I ſhould think this laſt, though done by good authors, to be contrary to the analogy of the language, eſpecially as we have two words for theſe oppoſite ideas regularly derived from the correſpondent adjectives, ingeniouſneſs and ingenuouſneſs.

3. Three or four times *successfully*, for *successively.* This is a blunder through ignorance, very common among the lower ſort of people in England.

4. *Intelligible* for *intelligent.* It was a very intelligible perſon who told me.

5. *Confisticate*, for *confiscate.* The moſt ignorant of the vulgar only uſe this phraſe.

6. *Fictious* for *fictitious.* That is no more than a *fictious* ſtory. This is uſed by people ſomewhat ſuperior to thoſe who would uſe the former.

7. *Veracity* for *credibility.* This is not a blunder in converſation only, But in ſpeaking and writing. I have ſome doubt of the veracity of this fact, ſays a certain author. Veracity is the character of the perſon ; truth or credibility, of the ſtory told. The ſame is the caſe with

all, or moſt of the words, of ſimilar formation, capacity, rapacity, tenacity. Theſe all are applied to the perſon or the diſpoſition, not to a particular action of the one, or effect of the other. We ſay, a man of capacity—this work is a proof of capacity, but not the capacity of this performance; and ſo of the reſt.

8. *Susceptive*, for *susceptible*. I muſt acquaint the reader, that after I had marked this word as an example of the miſtakes men fall into from ignorance, I found it in ſome Engliſh writers, who cannot be called altogether contemptible, and alſo in Johnſon's Dictionary. As to the laſt of theſe, I ſhall have occaſion to make a remark or two upon that lexicographer under the next claſs, and therefore ſhall ſay nothing of it now. As to the other particular, I obſerve, that though the word is uſed by ſome writers, it is not only contrary to general practice, but contrary to the analogy of the tongue. All the adjectives ending in *ive* are of an active, and thoſe ending in *able* or *ible* of a paſſive nature, as active, deciſive, communicative, ſignificative, demonſtrative, and on the contrary, able, capable, communicable, demonſtrable, contemptible.

9. They are ſo very *duplicit* that I am afraid they will *rescind* from what they have done. Here are two errors in one ſentence. *Duplicit* is an adjective made by gueſs from duplicity, and *rescind* is miſtaken, by the likeneſs of ſound, for *recede*.

10. *Detect*, for *dissect*. A lady, in a certain place at dinner, aſked a gentleman if he would be ſo good as *detect* that piece of meat for her. To theſe I might add a long liſt of errors, in which ignorance or orthography makes a vitious pronunciation, and that pronunciation continued by the ſame ignorance, makes a vulgar word in place of the true one, of which take one example—A gentleman writes to his friend, that on ſuch a day they had a ſmart *scrimitch*, for *skirmish*.

The ſixth claſs conſiſts of *cant* phraſes, introduced into public ſpeaking or compoſition. The meaning of *cant* phraſes, is pretty well known, having been fully explained as long ago as the days of Mr. Addiſon. They riſe

occaſionally, ſometimes perhaps, from the happy or ſingular application of a metaphor or alluſion, which is therefore repeated and gets into general uſe, ſometimes from the whim or caprice of particular perſons in coining a term. They are in their nature temporary and ſometimes local. Thus, it is often ſaid, a man is *taken in*, he is *bilked*, he is *bit*, that was a *hit* indeed, that is not *the thing*, it was quite *the thing*. Innumerable others will occur to every reader. Sometimes the cant conſiſts in the frequent and unneceſſary repetition, or improper application of a word that is otherwiſe unexceptionable. Thus, when *vaſt* was in repute, a thing was vaſtly good, and vaſtly bad, vaſtly pretty and vaſtly ugly, vaſtly great and vaſtly little.

It is worth while, in remarking on the ſtate of the language, to reflect a little on the attack made by Addiſon, Steel, Swift, Pope, and Arbuthnot, on many of theſe cant phraſes in their day, ſuch as bite, bamboozle, poſ. rep. mob, &c. Some of them they ſucceeded in baniſhing from, or rather prevented from being ever admitted into public diſcourſes and elegant writing, ſuch as bite, bamboozle, &c. ſome they baniſhed from all polite converſation, ſuch as poſ. rep. plenipo. and ſome have kept their ground, have been admitted into the language, and are freely and gravely uſed by authors of the firſt rank, ſuch as *mob*. This was at firſt a cant abbreviation of *mobile vulgus*, and as ſuch condemned by the great men above mentioned; but time has now ſtamped it with authority, the memory of its derivation is loſt, and when an hiſtorian ſays an unruly *mob* was aſſembled in the ſtreets, or he was torn in pieces by the *mob*, no idea of any thing low and ludicrous is conveyed to the mind of the reader.

I promiſed, under this head, to make a remark upon Johnſon's Dictionary. It is a book of very great value on ſeveral accounts, yet it may lead ignorant perſons into many miſtakes. He has collected every word, good or bad, that was ever uſed by any Engliſh writer; and though he has, in the larger Dictionary, given his authorities in full, yet that is not ſufficient to diſtinguiſh them. There are inſtances in which this may be the very cauſe of wrong judgment. If an author of reputation has committed a

ſingle error, his authority ſhould not be made uſe of to ſanctify that error—ſometimes, alſo, the author's deſign is miſtaken. In the abridgement of that Dictionary, at the word *bamboozle*, you find added, a *low word;* but the authority is *Arbuthnot:* now would not any man imagine, who was not otherwiſe informed, that Arbuthnot was a low writer; whereas, in fact, he uſed that word only to diſgrace and put it out of practice. The lexicographer would have acted more wiſely not to have mentioned the word at all.

It would be very eaſy to make a large collection of cant or low phraſes at preſent in uſe, ſuch as helter ſkelter, topſy turvy, upſide down, the Devil to pay, at ſixes and ſevens, put to his trumps, flung all in a heap. Every one of theſe has been ſeen in print, and many others of the ſame ſtamp, as well as heard in converſation.

It is not long ſince I read, in a piece publiſhed by a ſenſible writer in this city, 'low methods of *ſhamming Abraham.*' Now, pray what is ſhamming Abraham? With ſome difficulty I have underſtood, that it is a cant phraſe among ſeamen, for pretending ſickneſs when they are well, and other fetches of the ſame kind. I ſhould be glad to know how a foreigner could tranſlate this expreſſion into his own language.

Under the head of cant phraſes, I would include all proverbial or common ſayings introduced into the language, as well as trite and beaten alluſions. Of the firſt ſort are theſe, I want to put the ſaddle upon the right horſe, the laboring oar lies upon you; of the ſecond, the following, that is only *gratis dictum*, the Supreme Being by his almighty *fiat*, I will not pay any regard to *his ipse dixit.* All theſe are taken from printed pieces, ſome of them by authors not contemptible; the laſt of them, *his ipse dixit*, is of the moſt frequent uſe, and yet is the moſt pedantic and puerile of the whole. I conclude with obſerving, that a cant phraſe, if it do not die by the way, has three ſtages in its progreſs. It is, firſt, a cant phraſe; ſecondly, a vulgariſm; thirdly, an idiom of the language. Some expire in one or other of the two firſt ſtages; but if they outlive theſe, they are eſtabliſhed forever. I have

given an example of this above, in the word *mob;* and I think *topsy turvy* and *upside down* have very nearly attained the same privilege.

The seventh class consists of *personal blunders*, that is to say, effects of ignorance, and want of precision in an author, which are properly his own, and not reducible to any of the heads above mentioned. I shall give an example or two of this kind, because it will make the meaning of the former classes more clear. The examples follow.

1. 'The members of a popular government should be continually *availed* of the situation and condition of every part.' The author of this did not know that avail is neither an active nor passive, but a reciprocal verb; a man is said to *avail himself of* any thing, but not *to avail* others, or *be availed* by them.

2. 'A degree of dissentions and oppositions under some circumstances, and a political lethargy under others, *impend* certain ruin to a free state." Here a neuter verb is made an active one. I have before given some examples in which this is done commonly, but in the present case it belongs to this author alone.

3. 'I should have let your performance sink into *silent disdain.*' A performance may fall into contempt, or sink into oblivion, or be treated with disdain, but to make it sink into *silent disdain*, is a very crude expression indeed.

4. He is a man of most *accomplished* abilities. A man may be said to be of distinguished abilities or great accomplishments, but *accomplished abilities* is wholly new.

5. 'I have a *total* objection against this measure.' I suppose the gentleman meant, that he objected to the whole, and every part of it. It was only an irregular marriage of the adjective to the wrong substantive.

6. "An *axiom* as well established as any Euclid ever demonstrated." Now, it happens that Euclid, notwithstanding his great love of demonstration, never demonstrated axioms, but took them for granted.

I hope the reader will forgive me for not referring to the treatiſes from which theſe examples are taken. They were in general anonymous; and as it is probable many of the authors are alive, and may be of further uſe to their country, ſo being wholly unknown to me, without the leaſt degree of envy or malevolence, I mean not to injure but improve them.

FINIS.

SUBSCRIBERS' NAMES.

New-Hampshire.

Hon. Samuel Livermore, Esq.
Col. Moses Woodward
Rev. Elisha Thayer, Kingston
Mr. Charles Pearce (2 copies)
Richard Evans

Massachusetts.

His Excel. John Adams, President of the United States (2 copies)
Hon. John Lowell, Esq. Roxbury
Samuel Philips, Esq. Andover
Oliver Wendell, Esq. Boston
Josiah Quincy, Esq. do.
William Phillips, Esq. do.
Francis Dana, Esq. do.
Rev. David Tappan, D. D. Cambridge
Rev. Joseph Eckley, D. D. Boston
David Hyslop, Esq. Brookline
Rev. Thaddeus Mason Harris, Dorchester
Rev. Abiel Abbot, Haverhill
Mr. Joseph Hurd, Charlestown
Oliver Holden, do.
Rev. Jedediah Morse, do.
Isaac Warren, do.
John Davis, Esq. do.
Hon. Samuel Dexter, Esq.
Hon. Silas Lee, Esq.
Hon. William Shepard, Esq.
Mr. John Larkin, Charlestown
Eliphalet Pearson, Professor in Harvard University at Cambridge

Rhode-Island.

Hon. John Brown
Hon. Christopher G. Champlin

Vermont.

Hon. L. R. Morris

Connecticut.

Messrs. Hudson and Goodwin, bookfellers, Hartford, (6 copies)
Rev. Matthias Burnet, Norwalk
Rev. Timothy Dwight, President of Yale College
Rev. Samuel Blatchford, Stratfield

New-York.

His Excel. John Jay, Governor
Hon. James Watson
Hon. Jonas Platt
Hon. John Thomson
Rev. Dr. John Rodgers
John R. B. Rodgers, M. D.
John Broome, Esq.
Samuel Bayard, Esq. New Rochelle
Hon. Egbert Benson
Hon. Jacob Radcliffe
Hon. James Kent
Hon Morgan Lewis

Rev. Nathan Woodhull, Newtown, *Long*-Iſland
Mr. Cornelius Davis, bookſeller
Mr. John Mills
William Neilſon, merchant
Rev. George Faitoute, Jamaica, Long-Iſland
Mr. John Bingham
Rev. Methuſelah Baldwin
Mr. Leonard Blucher
David Hoſack, M. D.
Mr. George F. Hopkins, bookſeller, (6 copies)
James Hyer
Rev. Samuel Miller
Dr. Peter Wilſon, profeſſor in Columbia College
Mr. George Janeway
Tunis Joralman, Brooklyn
Nicholas R. Cowenhoven, Eſq. do.
Peter Van Pelt, ſtudent of divinity, Flatbuſh
Mr. Comfort Sand, do.
Albert Oblenis, do.
Rev. Philip Duryee, Narrows
George Barculoo, do.
James Inglis, ſtudent of divinity
Mr. Abraham Labagh
Rev. Mr. Romeyn, Schenectady.
Rev. Robert Smith, do.
Mr. Lather Halſey, do.
Cornelius D. Schamahorn, do.
John L. Zalinſkie, do.
Rev. Jonathan Edwards, preſident of Union College, do.
Mr. John C. Toll, do.
Harman H. Vidder, do.
Dirk Van Ingen, do.
Joſeph C. Yates, Eſq. do.
Mr. Robert Loague, do.
James Adair, do.
Rev. Samuel Smith, Saratoga
Rev. James V. C. Romayn, Greenbuſh
Rev. Winſlow Paige, Schaytiroke
Rev. Abraham Van Horn, Johnſon townſhip
Rev. Robert M'Dowell, Northumberland
Andrew Yates, profeſſor of Union College, Schenectady
Mr. Silas Wood
Col. Henry Rutgers
Mr. Moſes Rogers, merchant
Hon. John S. Hobert
Mr. William W. Woolſey, merchant,
Samuel Oſgood, Eſq.
Thomas Mackanefs, Eſq.
Rev. Gerardus A. Kuypers
Col. Anthony Poſt
Rev. John H. Livingſton, D. D.
William S. Johnſon, preſident of Columbia College
Mr. James R. Smith, merchant
James Scott, merchant
Hon. John Lanſing, jun.
Rev. William Linn, D. D.
John Keeſe, Eſq.
Mr. Divie Bithune, merchant
Daniel Phœnix, Eſq. chamberlaine of the city
Mr. Charles Snowden, printer
Mrs. Sarah Malcom
Mr. Andrew Smith, merchant
James Morriſon, do.
John Thompſon, do.
Alexander M'Gregor, do.
George Scott, do.
Charles Durgee, do.
Colin Gilleſpie, do.
Richard Varick, Eſq. mayor of the city
Mr. Thomas Buchanan, merchant
Rev. Abraham Beach
Rev. John M'Knight, D. D.
Mr. John Turner, jun. merchant
Anthony L. Bleecker, merchant
John Thompſon
Richard Cunningham
Rev. David S. Bogart, A. M. Southampton, L. I.

Mr. David Auchenoote, merchant
Thomas Stevenſon
Mrs. Elizabeth Hallet
Rev. John Kunze, D. D.
Mr. John Murray, merchant
William Wilſon, do.
Hon. Ezra L. Hommidieu, Southold, L. I.
Hon. Dirck Ten Broeck, Albany
Rev. Eliphalet Nott, do.
Mr. David Gordon, merchant
Rev. John B. Romeyn, Rhinbeck
Rev. John B. Johnſon, Albany
Mr. Evert Duyckinck (8 copies)
Meſſrs. C. R. & G. Webſter Albany (24 copies)
Brown & Stanſbury (4 do.)
Mr. William Barlas (3 do.)
John Rodgers
Rev. George Strebeck
John Williams
Mr. Ebenezer Holley
Alexander Kelly

New-Jersey.

His Excel. Richard Howell, Governor
Hon. Aaron Kitchell
Hon. John Condit
Hon. James Linn
Hon. Jonathan Dayton
Hon. Franklin Davenport
Hon. Eliſha Boudinot, New-Ark
Rev. Samuel S. Smith, preſident of the college at Princeton
Rev. John Duryee, Raritan
Rev. Aſa Hilyer, South-Hanover
Mr. William Griffith, Burlington.
Aaron Woodruff, Trenton
Robert Hunt
James Ewing, Eſq.
Iſaac Smith, Eſq.
Samuel Leake, Eſq.
Mr. Peter Gordon
John Beatty, Eſq.
Mr. B. Smith
J. Rhea
Rev. Thomas Armſtrong
Lucius Horatio Stockton, Eſq
Rev. Andrew Hunter
Mr. Thomas Yardley
John Morris
George M'Guffin, Bordenton
A. Hunn, do.
John Rutherford, do.
Daniel Marſh, Eſſex
George Anderſon, Burlington
Ephraim Martin, Middleſex
John Outwater, Bergen
John Lambert, Huntington
Abraham Kitchel, Morriſtown
William Parrett, Salem
Aſher Holmes, Monmouth
Henry Tophagen, Haſenſack
L. W. Stockton, Flemington
Peter Hunt, Lamberton
Azarias Hunt, do.
George Henry, do.
Joſhua L. Howell, Woodbury
J. A. Pearſon, Princeton
Iſrael S. Harris, Somerſet
Frederick Frelinghuyſen, do.
Peter Hanſon, Trenton
John M'Lean, Princeton
John N. Simpſon, do.
Connant Cone, do.
Thomas P. Johnſon, do. (2 copies)
John Thompſon
Nicholas Everet
Charles T. Mercer
Chriſtopher H. Stryker
John W. Smith
J. H. Hobert
John M'Mullin, Benſalem
Robert Voorhus, Princeton

Mr. John Harrifon
Richard Stockton
Frederick Beafley
Henry Kollock
W. Waſhington
Thomas C. Alexander
Francis Sinnickſon
John G. Gamble
Adam S. Dandridge
William Knox, jun.
Wilmot S. Gebbes
Thomas M. Bailey
Richard D. Bayley
Joſeph Granier
John Middleton
Edward Watts
Edmund Penn
William B. Wilſon
Henry Watkins
Charles Lewis
James Caldwell
John Brown, jun.
John Johnſon
Noah Crane
Samuel Wimbiſh
Aſa K. Lewis
John W. Ramſay
Clement Early
George Emlen
John Hand
Ennion W. Skelton
Littleton Robins, jun.
Richard H. Henderſon
Edmund Bruyn, Princeton
Elias Elmaker
James Bunyan
Chriſtopher Longſtreet
Van Polanen
Gen. Joſeph Bloomfield, Burlington
Mr. William Cox, jun.
George Painter
Miſs Lydia Riche
Rev. C. C. Wharton
Mr. Peter Hill
Chriſtian Heiſs
William Griffith
Robert Hunt, Trenton
Capt. Abraham Gurlain, do.
Gen James Giles, Bridgetown
Rev. Joſeph Clark, Brunſwick
Hon. Andrew Kirkpatrick
Hon William Patterſon
John Bayard Eſq.
John Neilſon, Eſq.
Dr. Moſes Scott
Mr. James Richmond, merchant
William Lawſon, do.
Perez Rowley, do.
John Pool, do.
Iſaac W. Crane, Eſq. attorney at law
William P. Deare, Eſq. do.
Mr. John Plumb
John A. Myer
Dr. Adam Anderſon
Hon. James H. Imlay
John Imlay, Eſq.
Robert Montgomery, Eſq.
Col. Samuel Quay, merchant
Mr. Richard Horſefull
Henry Harper
Dr. Charles Smith
Mr. Jacob Klady
Simon Hyllier
Andrew Lyſle
Anthony W. White
Jacob Hendrickſon
John Quay
Capt. Job Stockton
Mr. Garret D. Wikoff
Rev. George S. Woodhull
Mr. Jacob Fiſher
Rev. David Barclay
Mr. Abraham Van Neſte
Rev. Ira Condict
Rev. Elias Van Bunſcooten
Rev. Benjamin Dubois
Rev. James S. Cannon
Rev. Henry Pothemus
Rev. John M. Van Harlingen
Rev. John S. Vredenburgh
Rev. Iſaac Van Dozen
Rev. Matthew La Rue
Rev. Benjamin Lindſay
Mr. James Schureman
Frederick Van Dyke
John Harrifon, Princeton
James Hamilton
Edmund Elmendorf (2 copies)
Cliofophic Society at the Naſſau-Hall
Miſs Grace Little

Mifs Mary Cuthbert
Mr Daniel Agnew
Joſias Fergufon
Benjamin B. Hopkins, Trenton (2 copies)
Mifs Catharine Smith, do.
Rev. William Boyd
Rev. Ebenezer Grant, New-Brunfwick
Dr. Samuel Kennedy, Hardwich
Gen. William Helm, Hackett's Town
Joſeph Gaſton, Eſq. Hardwick
Abraham & Iſaac Shaver, do.
Mr. George John Armſtrong, do.
Nehemiah Dunham, do.
Rev. Joſeph Rue, Hopewell
Rev David Comfort, Kingſton
Rev. Matthew L. Perrie, Monmouth
Mr. David Biſhop, Amwell
Rev. John Cornell, Allentown
Mr. Benjamin B. Hopkins, Princeton
Henry G. Wiſner, do.
Jonathan Elmer, M. D.
Elias Boudinot, Eſq.
Mr. Iſaac Anderſon
Thomas Olden, jun.
Robert G. Johnſon
Rev. Holway Hunt

Pennsylvania:

His Excel. Thomas M'Kean, Governor
Hon. William Bingham
Hon. James Roſs
Hon. Robert Brown
Hon. Thomas Hartley,
Hon. Joſeph Heiſter
Hon. John A. Hanna
Hon. Peter Muhlenberg
Hon. John Smilie
Hon. Robert Waln
Hon. H. Woods
James M'Henry, Eſq. ſecretary of war, Philadelphia
Timothy Pickering, Eſq.
Rev. Aſhbel Green
Rev. William Marſhal
Rev. Jacob Janeway
Rev. William White, biſhop
Rev. William Rogers
Rev. James Abercrombie
Rev. John B. Linn
Rev. Samuel Magaw
Rev. Samuel Blair
Rev. John Anderſon
Rev. John B. Paterſon, Danville
Rev. William Latta, Great-Valley
Rev. Samuel Ralſton, Waſhington county
Rev. James Dunlap, Fayette county
Ebenezer Hazard, Eſq. Philadelphia
Benjamin Ruſh, M. D.
William Shippen, M. D.
John C. Otto, M. D.
Mrs. Mary Moyes
Mr. William Haſlet
Cornelius W. Stafford
Mrs. M'Cullough
Samuel Finlay
Joſeph K. Milnor
William Smiley
Richard Folwell
Mrs. Smith
Mr. James A. Neale
John Lockwood
William Hill
Francis Thomkins
Charles W. Goldſborough
John O'Conner
Joſeph Parrot
Robert Ralſton
Hugh Jackſon
Robert Smith
Ebenezer Fergufon, Eſq.
Mr. John Strawbridge
John W. Vandeave, Eſq.
Mr. Francis Shallus
James Finley
Joſeph Dennie
James Robinſon
Samuel M'Clemon
George Miffliu
John H. Hobart
David Jackſon, j
George Barclay

Mr. Enos Bronſon
Jeſſe Waln
Edward Pennington, Eſq.
Mr. John Ormrod
Silas Engles, jun.
John Harris
John C. Kelſey
Mrs Bitha Earl
Iſaac Heylin, M. D.
Mr. Charles Evans
Philip Dick
John Hanley
David Hall
William M'Culley
Thomas Jacquet
George Phillips
Thomas Wotherſpoon
Hugh Kelley
Francis Peoples
Samuel Hodgdon
William Buckell
H. H. Brackenridge, Eſq.
Mr. John Levis, Springfield
Rev. Charles Neſbit, preſident of Dickinſon college, Carliſle
Mrs. Iſabella Oliver
Rev. John Linn
Mr. Armſtrong Brandon
Charles M'Clure
William Lyon, Eſq.
Mr. John P. Thomſon
Archibald Loudon
Rev. Thomas M'Pherrin, Franklin county
Mr. George Crawford
John Wray
Thomas Cellar
John Work
William Duffield
James Wray
William Davis
John Scott
James Buchanan
Patrick Campbell
Henry Work
John King
Joſeph Vanlear
George Acre
John Johnſon
John and David Kennedy
Hon. James Riddle
Hon. James Chambers
Mr. Robert Johnſon
James M'Vieſſon
Benjamin Chambers
Mr. James Orbiſon, Franklin county
Nicholas Clopper
Edward Crawford
William M. Brown
George Clarke
William Alliſon
William Magaw
Archibald Rankin
Robert M'Clanahan
James Poe
Rev John Black, York county
Walter Smith, Eſq
William M'Pherſon, Eſq
Mr. James Scott
Thomas Ewing, Eſq
Mr. Matthew Longwell
Alexander Irwin
John Carrick
Marmaduke Wilſon
Rev Joſhua Williams
Rev Francis Laird
Mr. Hugh Watſon
Rev. William Paxton
James Adair, ſtud. in div.
Mr. Richard Brown
Moſes M'Clean
John Foſter
David Wilſon
Robert Slemons
Hugh King
Alexander Cobean, Eſq
Mr. David Edie
John Dickſon, Eſq
Alexander Ruſſel, Eſq
Mr. Benjamin Reed
Samuel Knox
William Gillitands, Eſq
Mr. William Scott
Samuel M'Callough
Patrick M'Koig
Abraham Scott
William Hill
William M'Goughy
Samuel Witherow
John Robinſon
Joſeph M'Ginley
William Bigham

Mr. James Burd
John Reid
Rev. David M'Conaughy
Mr. Graham J. Bouchir, Philadelphia
Mr. Daniel Wiſtar, Philadelphia
John Cooke
James Darrach
Patrick Kerr Rogers
George Gibbons
Matthew Smith
John P. Peckworth
Capt Abraham Burling
Mr. John C. Kelſey
Thomas W. Tallman
Blair M'Clenachan
John Davidſon
William H. Harriſon
Samuel Hyndman
Mrs. Mary M'Alliſter
John Buyers, Eſq. Sunbury
Daniel Stroud, Eſq Stroudſbourg
Mr. William Trimble, Concord
Rev. John Young, Green Caſtle
Mr. James Maccoun (6 copies
Thomas Shanklin
James Crawford
Charles M'Pheeters
Samuel Clarkſon
Frederick Smith, Eſq
William Kirkpatrick
John M'Dowell, Eſq
Rev Phillip Milledoler
Mr. William Trimble
William Coats, Eſq
Rev James Snodgraſs
Joſhua Williams
Henry R. Wilſon
John Boyd
John Moody
Mr. Samuel Bell
Joſiah Graham
John Miller, M. C.
Samuel M'Cormick
Rev. James Graham
Jonathan Walker, Eſq
Mr John M'Kiffick
Mr. Calvin Gould
Rev James Dunlap
Alexander Ruſſel, Eſq
John Downey, Eſq
Mr Francis Meredith
Joſeph Morriſon
John Ruſſel
Henry Williams, Eſq
Mr Vanlear, Eſq
James Spur
Samuel Riddle, Eſq
John M'Pherſon, Eſq
George Laſhell, Eſq
Rev John Smith
Peter Wallace
David Lawſon
Rev James M'Lain
Mr James Alliſon
John M'Laughlin, jun
John Wilſon
Cornelius Blue
Thomas Sanderſon
John Finley
James Caldwell
William Fullerton
Thomas Brown
Daniel Smith
Charles Eckles
James Eldor
Robert Barnes (6 copies)
John Gibſon
James Guthrie
Joſeph Barnet
John Alliſon
William Turnbull

Delaware.

Rev John Ewing Latta
Mr. John Stites, lower townſhip, Cape May
John Waugh
Robert L. Smith
Richard Hanbly
William Haughey
James M'Culloch
John Bird
John Wiley
James Caldwell
William C. Frazer, Eſq.
French Macmillan, Eſq
Gen. Maxwell Blues
Capt David Nivan

George Read, Esq
James Tilton, M. D.
Mr John Dickinson
Jesse Harris
D. M'Calmont
Mordecai M'Kinney
Rev Joshua Reece
Mr. Jacob Robinson
Jacob Brown
M. Anderson

Maryland.

Hon Gabriel Christie
Hon William Craik
Hon Samuel Smith
Mr. James Cowen
Rev John B. Slemons, Somerset county
Mr. Samuel Ker
James Wilson
James Laird
Thomas G. Fountain
George W. Jackson
John C. Wilson
William Handy
Denwood Wilson
John Landreth
John Done
Peter Sharp, Easton
Rev Patrick Ellison, Baltimore
Mr. James H. M'Culloch, do.
Nathaniel Nesbit, Washington county
John Martin, Baltimore
Luther Martin, Esq
Mr. John Martin, merchant taylor, Baltimore
James Martin, do.
James Priestley, president of Baltimore Academy
Isaac Edmonston, merchant
Barnabas Redman, printer
Ebenezer Finley, merchant
Mr. Joel Munson
Robert R. Richardson

Virginia.

His Excel. George Washington, late lieutenant-general of the armies of the United States
His Excel. Thomas Jefferson, now president of the United States
Mr Samuel Annin, Harper's ferry
Dr Samuel L. Campbell, Lexington
Mr Matthew Houston, (6 copies
Rev Robert Wilson
Rev Dr. Mure, Alexandria
James Gilmore, Esq
Charles Campbell, Esq
Mr William Lyle
Rev George Baxter
Mr David Shields
James Gold (2 copies)
Rev. Daniel Blaine
Gen. Samuel Blackburn, Rockbridge
Col James M'Dowell
Col John M'Conky
Rev. Archibald Alexander, Prince Edward (2 copies)
Rev. Archibald M'Robert
Mr James Morton
Rev Matthew Lyle
Rev. Drury Lacy
Mr Jacob Woodson
Col Philemon Holcombe
Mr Conrad Speece, jun
John H. Rice
James Aiken
Richard Gordon
Rev Moses Hoge, Shepherd's town
Mr. John Morrow
John Kearsley
Robert Wilcox, Martinsburg
Miss Fanny Campbell, Berkeley
Mr Jacob Vandaran
John Venosdal
John Melville, Berkeley
John Taylor
James Sherney
Rev. Samuel Brown, Rockbridge
Mr Andrew Finley
Joseph White
James M'Cheng
William M'Pheters

Rev Nash Le Grand, Frederick county
Miss Ann Vance
Mr James D. Vance
S. Simral
James Chipley
John Gordon
William Vance
Henry Beatty
Beatty Carson
Jos. Gamble
Rev William M'Pheeters
Maj David Stephenson
Joseph Bell, Esq
William and James Bell
John Coalter, Esq
Alex Nelson, Esq
Rev John Chavis
Dr Robert Patillo
Maj William Marshall
Mr Jacob Chavis
Alexander Crawford
John Gay
Rev John M'Cue

North-Carolina.

Hon Timothy Bloodworth
Rev John Anderson
Rev James Hall, Iredell county
Mr Thomas Hall
James King
Andrew Pickens
Richard King, Esq
Mr Hugh Hall
William Sharp, Esq
Mr James H. Hull
Joseph Kilpatrick
John Cochran
Rev. J. D. Kilpatrick
Rev. Lewis T. Wilson
Mr Alexander Ewing
Enos Sherrill
Thomas Morrison, Esq
Mr John Wallis
Reuben Alexander
Abraham Hill
M. Matthews, Esq
Mr John M'Clellan
William Stevenson, Esq
Rev David Caldwell, Guilford county
Rev William Hodge
Rev John Robinson
Rev Andrew Caldwell
Mr Joseph Hodge
Ezekiel Currie
Duncan Buie
Rev William Paisley
Rev Robert Tate
Rev William Moore
Mr Edward Pharr
William Denny, Guilford county
James Denny
Hugh Shaw
John Matthews
Murdock M'Millan
Malcolm M'Nair
Murdock Murphy
Michael Montgomery
Daniel Brown
Simon Landreth
Hugh Shaw
John Campbell
David Faffet
Andrew Flinn
Samuel Stanford
J. S. Gillaspie
John Gillaspie
Angus M'Dermaid
Duncan Brown
John Munroe
Neill Brown
Samuel Cummings
Florence Cameron
Mrs Mary Cameron
Mr Archibald M'Neill
Robert Hanna, jun
Joseph M'Dowell
David Price
James Smiley
John Cunningham
John W. Caldwell
Constantine Ladd
Moses Peden
Thomas Lloyd
John Laird
Adam Smith, sen
William Davis
Nathaniel Moody
Archibald Campbell
John Nicholson
James Stewart
Isham Veft
Jo. Banner

Mr. Joſeph Ladd
William Greigg
A. Robinſon
Edmund Hatch
J. Harper
John M'Adow
Samuel M'Adow
Jonathan Parker, Eſq
Mr Alexander Clarke
William Armfield, Eſq
Mr. George Finley
William Dick
Daniel Donnel
Hugh Wilſon
H. Hamilton
Z. D. B. Naſher
John Cummings
J. Moore
Samuel Lindſay
Thomas Barnett
John Rankin
Andrew Wilſon, ſen
Andrew Wilſon, jun
William Reeve
James Gibſon
Robert Hodge
W. Mebane
James Dick
John F. Thompſon
John S. Fall
Finley Stewart
David Caldwell, jun
Maj James W. Smith
Mr James Smith
John P. Smith
William Shepard, ſen
Samuel Smith, Eſq
Capt Alexander Murphy
Mr Robert Donnell
Rev Thomas J. Hall, (30 cop.

South-Carolina.

Thomas Legare, jun Eſq John's Iſland
Dr Joſeph Hall Ramſay, Charleſton
James Legare, Eſq John's Iſland
William Briſbane, Eſq Slann's Iſland
Mrs Sarah Yonge, Charleſton
Margaret Jenkins
Suſanna Wilkinſon, jun
Mr Charles Snowden
David Adams, Wadmelaw Iſland
Nathaniel Ruſſel, Eſq Charleſton
Miſs Jane Huxham
Miſs Mary Legare, John's Iſl.
Thomas Jones, Eſq Pref. bank of S. C. Charleſton
Henry William De Sauſſure, Eſq
Mrs Ann Toomer
Mr. Anthony Toomer
Thomas Bennett
Thomas Lehre, Eſq
William S. Smith, Eſq
George Parker, Eſq
Mr Kinſey Burden
Micah Jenkins
Daniel Stevens, Eſq
Mrs. Francis Legare
Margaret Stock
Mr Jacob Axſon
James Badger
Rev James M'Elherney, John's Iſland
Mrs —— Brownlee, Charleſton
Timothy Ford, Eſq
Rev Andrew Steele, Wilton
Dr James E. B. Finley, Beaufort
Paul Hamilton, Eſq St Bartholomews
William Hayne, Eſq Wilton
Mrs Jean Slann, Slann's Iſl.
Iſaac Hayne, Eſq St Bartholomews
Mr John S. Walter
William Ofwald
Alfred Walter
William M'Cants
Rev Thomas H. Price, James Iſland
Francis Rivers, ſen
Francis Rivers, jun
John Todd
Edward Freer
Joſiah Rivers
Narwood Witter
William Royall
James Haſkins, Eſq
John Todd, Eſq

Rev W. Hollingſhead, D. D. Charleſton
Rev Iſaac S. Keith, D. D.
Dr William S. Stephens
Dr Edward D. Smith
Morton Waring, Eſq
Mrs Mary Waring
Suſanna Poſtell
Ann Faiſſoux
Margaret Young
Mary Ann Shrewſbury
Joſiah Smith, Eſq, Caſhier of National Branch bank
Rev. Dr. M'Calla, Chriſt's church
Rev James Adams, Dorcheſter
Dr Thomas H. M'Calla, Charleſton
Dr Richard Waring, Beachhill
Henry M. Evans, Eſq
Mrs Sarah You, Charleſton
Mary Turpin
Sarah Parker
Iſaac Perry, Eſq Dorcheſter
Mrs Mary E. Droze
Mr Samuel Prior
John Roſe
John Carr
William Flack, St Pauls
William Patterſon
Charles Steed, Wadmelaw Iſland
Thomas Fickling
Francis Fickling
Henry Hanna, Williamſb.
Mrs E B Hatter, Charleſton
Mr William Paine
Hugh Simpſon
Alexander Robertſon
John M'Dowel, Charleſton
John Johnſon, Eſq
Mr Joſeph Hoger, jun
William Leech
Jeremiah Roſe
Jeſſe Elmore
Edward B Morgan
Daniel Crukſhanks
Dr John Noble
Mr Joſeph Mecomb
William Puſley
William Lane
Mr Samuel Dickſon
Rev William Williamſon, Fair Foreſt
Dr Thomas Welliamſon, Sporter county
Col Hugh Means, Fair Foreſt
Mr Samuel Archibald
Henry Story
James Mayers, jun
Moſes White
Hugh Dickſon, A. B. Pendleton county
Mr Samuel Otterſon, Union county
Rev Robert Wilſon, Abbeville
Mrs Suſannah Ogier
Mary (Solomon) Legare
Eliza Cochran
John Parker, Eſq
Mrs Heſter Hutſon
Mary Colcock
Capt Benjamin Stiles
Gracia Rivers, Eſq
Mr William Rivers, ſen
Jonah Rivers, ſen
Mrs Suſannah Rivers
(Richard) Waring
Anne Barnewell
—— M'Intoſh
Mary Lambell
William Roach, Eſq
Mrs Ann Waring
Mr Paul Walers
Jacob Walter
Richard Singleton
Mrs Mary Barnewell
Dr J R Witherſpoon
Rev John M'Roberts
Mr William Champlin
William H Capers, Eſq
Paul Fripp
John Jenkins, ſen
John Jenkins, jun
John Wardlaw
Benjamin Montgomery
Joſeph Pope
Joſeph Edings
Benjamin Champlin
Rev Joſeph Cook
Dr Archibald Campbell
Mr Stephen Lawrence
James Scanlin

Maj J H Cuthbert
Col Thomas Thomas Talbird
Dr James Stuart
Mr Thomas Fuller
John Screven
John Rhodes
Robert Witherſpoon
Rev John Hemphill
Charles Tew, Eſq (4 copies)
Rev John Coufar
William G Roſborough
Iſaac Dunnom
Alex Carnes
Mrs Letitia Wigg
Sarah Givens
Mr William Hutton
John Gray
William Leſley, Eſq
Robert M'Cann, Eſq
Mr Andrew Weed
Hugh Wardlaw
Samuel Roſemond
James Watts
Samuel Strain
Michael M'Kee
John Dixon
John Bell
John Caldwell, Eſq
Mr Samuel Young
William Baſkin, jun
Mr John Lowry Elder
Hugh Mecklin Elder
John Burkſdale
James S Baſkin
Rev Alexander Porter
Rev Francis Cummins, A M

Kentucky.

Hon John Brown
Hon Humphrey Marſhal
Rev James Blythe
Mr P. Patterſon
Alexander Telford
Robert Marthall
Alex. Parker Lexington
Anthony Logan
John M'Dowell
Andrew M'Calla
John Caldwell
James Welſh
James Crawford
Jacob Fiſhback, Clark co.
Sam. Rannels, Bourbon co.
Isaac Tull
Barton W. Stone
Joſeph P. Howe, Montgomery county
J. Hopkins, Bourbon co.
Samuel Shannon, Woodford county
Wm Robiſon, Harriſon
Malcolm Worley
J Thomſon, Bourbon co
Robert Steele, Fayette
John Lyle, Clarke county
Iſaac Barr, Fayette county
William Wylie, Scott's co
Sam Robertſon, Harriſon
James Moore, Lexington

Tennessee.

Hon William Cock
Mr Gideon Blackburn
Robert Henderſon

Georgia.

Rev Robert Cunningham
Thomas Newton
Benjamin Thompſon
William Montgomery
Col Samuel Alexander
Maj Benjamin Baldwin
Dr William W Strain
William E Philips, Eſq
Mr Martin Martin
Edward Pharr
William Wallace

London.

Thomas Williams (25 copies)

Date Due

FACULTY	[illegible]		
[illegible]			
OCT 15 '63	MAY 24 '76		
OCT 29 '63	JUL 2 '75		
[illegible]	MAR [illegible]		
FACULTY	MAY 31 1976		
JAN 3 '66	[illegible]		
FACULTY	JUN 15 1977		
[illegible]	MAY 20 1977		
[illegible]	NOV [illegible]		
FACULTY	JUN 15 1981		
[illegible]	JUN 15 1982		
[illegible]			
	JAN 31 '68		
FEB 13 '70	JUN 15 1985		
[illegible]	JUN 15 1986		
MAY [illegible]	JAN 31 1987		
SEP 12 '74			
MAR 3 [illegible]			

PRINTED IN U. S. A.